E416
.D38

E 416
.D38
Copy 1

THE UTICA CONVENTION.

VOICE OF NEW-YORK!!

Proceedings of the Utica Convention, February 16, 1848, with the Speeches of JOHN VAN BUREN, GEORGE RATHBUN, &c.

"Free Trade, Free Labor, Free Soil, Free Speech and Free Men."

A Convention of Delegates from the various Assembly Districts of the State of New York, convened at the Court House in the city of Utica, on the 16th day of February, 1848, in accordance with the following recommendation of the Democratic Members of the Legislature:

Resolved, That it is recommended that the democratic electors of each assembly district in this State, to appoint a delegate to a State Convention, to be held with authority to choose delegates to represent the democracy of the State in the next National Convention, held for the purpose of nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States; or to determine the manner in which such delegates to the said National Convention shall be chosen.

Resolved, That the State Convention be held at Utica, on the 16th day of February next, at 12 o'clock M.

The Convention thus assembled was called to order by JOHN KEYES PAIGE, of Albany, on whose motion, ABRAHAM BOCKEE, of Dutchess, was appointed Chairman.

On motion of JACOB GOULD, of Monroe, DANIEL H. TOMPKINS, of Queens, was appointed Secretary.

On motion of P. H. THOMAS, of Rensselaer, C. T. VARY, of Livingston, was appointed an additional Secretary.

On calling the roll 97 delegates, from 51 counties, were found to be present. A telegraphic despatch was received from Albany, announcing that ten delegates from New York and three from Kings, were in that city, and would arrive by the 1 o'clock train.

On motion of SAXTON SMITH, of Putnam, a committee, to be composed of one Delegate from each Judicial District, was ordered to be appointed to report permanent officers for the Convention.

On motion of JOHN VAN BUREN, of Albany, a committee, to be similarly constituted, was ordered to be appointed to report an Address.

On motion of P. H. THOMAS, of Rensselaer, a like committee was ordered to be appointed, to report a series of resolutions for the consideration of the Convention.

Under these motions, the Chair named the following committees, viz:—

On Organization.

2d	District,	SAXTON SMITH, of Putnam.
1st	"	J. H. MCMAHON, of N. Y.
3d	"	P. H. THOMAS, of Rensselaer.
4th	"	RUFUS HEATON, of Clinton.
5th	"	WILLIAM TAYLOR, of Onondaga.
6th	"	THOMAS FARRINGTON, of Tioga.
7th	"	THOMAS SMITH, of Ontario.
8th	"	T. B. CAMPBELL, of Chautauque.

On Address.

3d	District,	JOHN VAN BUREN, Albany.
1st	"	LUCIUS ROBINSON, of N. Y.
2d	"	JOHN G. FLOYD, of Suffolk.
4th	"	CALVIN T. HURLBURT, of St. Lawr.
5th	"	CHAS. A. MANN, of Oneida.
6th	"	O. C. CROCKER, of Broome.
7th	"	BENJ. TUTHILL, of Yates.
8th	"	ISAAC SHERMAN, of Erie.

E416
D38

On Resolutions.

8th District, Jas. R. Doolittle, Wyoming.
1st " Nelson J. Waterbury, N. Y.
2d " Robert Denniston, Orange.
3d " James Storms, Columbia.
4th " S. S. Cowen, Washington.
5th " Dennis McCarthy, Onondaga.
6th " Samuel Medbury, Chenango.
7th " Jacob Gould, Monroe.

The Convention adjourned to 2½ P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Committee on the nomination of permanent officers, through Mr. Smith, their Chairman, reported the following, viz:

President:

Hon. JOHN TRACY, of Chenango.

Vice Presidents:

1st Dist. Henry Keyser, of New York.
2d " Robt. Denniston, of Orange.
3d " John Keyes Paige, of Albany.
4th " H. S. Johnson, of St. Lawrence.
5th " Abijah Beckwith, of Herkimer.
6th " Henry S. Randall, of Cortland.
7th " George Rathbun, of Cayuga.
8th " H. P. Darrow, of Erie.

Secretaries:

Daniel H. Tompkins, of Queens.
Calvin P. Vary, of Livingston.
James W. Nye, of Madison.
James S. Whallon, of Essex.

The report of the Committee was unanimously adopted, and the officers elect having taken their seats, the President returned thanks to the Convention for the honor conferred in the following

ADDRESS.

Gentlemen of the Convention:

I return to you my grateful acknowledgements for the honor you have conferred upon me in electing me to preside on this occasion, and assure you I shall endeavor to discharge the duties of the Chair in a satisfactory manner.

Assembled as the Representatives of the Democratic party in this State it will be expected of us, in our action here, that we sustain the political principles of that party and the men who have adopted and will faithfully adhere to those principles.

This Convention has been organized according to the invariable usages of the Democracy of the State—usages so uniform and universally adhered to, that no attempt has ever been made, except in a recent instance, to organize a State Convention in any other manner.

Upon this foundation, a regular organization, and a firm and vigorous support of Democratic principles, let us hope that all who desire the predominance of these principles, all sections of the Democratic party, may cordially unite to secure the triumph of our own cause in the State and Nation, and the greatest good to our country.

H. O. Cheesebro was admitted as a regularly substituted delegate from Ontario, in place of Albert Lester absent, and Charles K. Loomis, a like substitute from Jefferson in place of A. L. Green.

On motion of Mr. Rathbun, Jonathan Brown and Wm. Glover, were admitted as substitutes for the two absent delegates from Cayuga co.

The roll was directed to be called, when the following delegates, 118 in number, answered to their names:

Albany—John Keyes Paige. Andrew J. Colvin, John Van Buren, Barent S. Winne.
Allegany—William Cobb, L. P. Wetherby.
Broome—Oliver C. Crocker.
Cayuga—George Rathbun, Jonathan Brown, William Glover.
Chautauque—T. B. Campbell,
Chemung—Green Bennitt.
Chenango—John Tracy, Samuel Medbury.
Clinton—Rufus Heatoo.
Columbia—Seneca M. Dorr, James Storms.
Cortland—Henry S. Randall.
Delaware—Johnson B. Bragg, Linus Porter.
Dutchess—Abraham Bockee, Treadwell Townsend.
Erie—Isaac Sherman, H. P. Darrow, Dexter Ewell.
Essex—James S. Whallon.
Fulton & Hamilton—Clark S. Grinnell.
Genesee—Dan Sprague, Harry Wilbur.
Greene—Isaac Pruyn, Lewis Crandell.
Herkimer—Jefferson Tillinghast, Abijah Beckwith.
Jefferson—A. W. Danforth, S. Bond, C. K. Loomis.
Kings—Philip S. Crooke, Thomas Hegaman, George Hall.
Lewis—Seymour Greene.
Livingston—C. P. Vary, Hector Hitchcock.
Madison—James W. Nye, V. W. Mason.
Monroe—Jacob Gould, William Wood, Simeon B. Jewett
Montgomery—John Nellis, M. Freeman.
New-York—Stephen R. Harris, John McMahon, N. J. Waterbury, Daniel W. Clark, Robert H. Maclay, Robert Getty, John E. Develin, Wilson Small, Jacob Miller, Wilson G. Hunt, J. S. Vosburgh, Thomas B. Tappen, Lucius Robinson, Henry Keyser, Thomas Claughley.
Niagara—Charles J. Fox, J. Jay Lawyer.
Oneida—Charles A. Mann, B. B. Hyde, Truman Enos, Richard Hulburt.
Onondaga—Dennis McCarthy, William Taylor, Cyrus H. Kingsley, Wm. Henderson.
Ontario—Thomas Smith, H. O. Cheesebro.
Orange—Robt. Denniston, Lewis Cuddeback, Abm. C. McBurney.
Orleans—Peter Saxe.
Oswego—Beman Brockway, John B. Watson.
Otsego—S. S. Burnside, J. P. Sill, John C. Spafford.
Putnam—Saxton Smith.
Queens—Daniel H. Tompkins.
Rensselaer—George M. Selden, P. H. Thomas, Henry N. Wales.
Richmond—J. S. Westervelt.
Rockland—Matthew D. Bogert.
St. Lawrence—Preston King, H. S. Johnson, Calvin T. Hulburd.
Saratoga—Abram Y. Lansing, P. H. Cowen.
Schenectady—William Cunningham.
Schoharie—O. Hatch.
Seneca—S. G. Hadley.
Steuben—Charles Graves, Otto F. Marshall, F. R. E. Cornell.
Suffolk—John G. Floyd.
Tioga—Thomas Farrington.
Tompkins—Charles M. Turner, Harvey A. Dowe.
Ulster—James Oliver, Jonathan D. Ostrander.
Warren—William B. Farlin.
Washington—S. S. Cowen, John McLean.
Wayne—R. Merrick, Theron R. Strong.
Westchester—J. P. Peck, Jesse Ryder.
Wyoming—James R. Doolittle.
Yates—Benjamin Tuthill.

No delegates appeared from the counties of Cattaraugus, Franklin and Sullivan.

Mr. Doolittle, from the committee on resolutions, reported in part the two following resolutions, and asked leave to sit again:—

Resolved, That the delegates from this State to the Democratic Republican National Convention, for the nomination of Candidates for President and Vice President,

shou d be selected by general ticket in accordance with the sage of the Democracy of the State of New York, es- shed and heretofore adhered to, upon full and delib- examination, as well as with the general practice of t lemocracy of other States.

esolved, That a committee consisting of one member m each Congressional District, be appointed to report e names of 36 delegates to the National Convention, and lso of an alternate to each district.

Mr. JEWETT, of Monroe, moved to amend the 1st resolution by confining the action of this convention, to the appointment of two Senatorial delegates, leaving to the people of the several Congressional Districts, the appointment of the remaining thirty-four delegates.

Mr. BOCKEE proposed that the Chair appoint eight delegates, one from each Congressional District, to report the names of the two delegates for the State at large, leaving the question as to the appointment of the remaining delegates, open for future consideration.

The ayes and noes were called on Mr. JEWETT's amendment to adopt the District System:

Five delegates only, viz: Messrs. CROOKE, of Kings, GOULD, WOOD, and JEWETT, of Monroe, and GETTY, of New York; (the latter stating that he did so under instructions,) voted in the affirmative: so the question was lost.

The first resolution was then unanimously adopted.

The question next arising on the adoption of the second resolution,

Mr. JEWETT, of Monroe, moved to amend, by giving the Chair the power of appointing the Committee. Lost.

Mr. THOMAS moved a further amendment, that the delegates from each Congressional District, be empowered to name their delegate to the National Convention, subject to the approval of this Convention.

Mr. WALES moved that the delegates from each Congressional District name their own Committee-man.

Mr. RATHBUN, of Cayuga, proposed that the delegates from each Congressional District, except New York, appoint one committee-man, and that the N. Y. city delegation appoint four.

An animated debate sprung up on the amendments, in which Messrs. SELDEN and WALES, of Rensselaer, JEWETT, of Monroe, COWEN, of Saratoga, COLVIN and VAN BUREN, of Albany, and others participated. Finally,

On motion of Mr. COLVIN, of Albany, the amendments were all laid on the table, and the following adopted as a substitute for the second resolution:

Resolved, That the Chair appoint a Committee of one from each Congressional District to report to this Convention thirty-six Delegates to the National Convention, and also an alternate to each Delegate.

Mr. WALES moved to amend by striking out the words "by the Chair." Lost.

The resolution was then adopted.

Adjourned to 6½ P. M.

EVENING SESSION.

The Convention met at the Methodist Church, in order to accommodate the large audience in attendance on its deliberations.

The Chair announced the following as the Committee to report names of delegates to the National Convention, viz:

1st	Con.	Dist.	D. H. Tompkins.
2d	"	"	Philip S. Crooke.
3d	"	"	S. R. Harris.
4th	"	"	Wilson Small.
5th	"	"	John E. Develin.
6th	"	"	J. S. Vosburgh.
7th	"	"	Matthew D. Bogert.
8th	"	"	Abram Bockee.
9th	"	"	Lewis Cuddeback.
10th	"	"	James Oliver.
11th	"	"	Lewis Crandell.
12th	"	"	Geo. M. Selden.
13th	"	"	J. Keyes Paige.
14th	"	"	John McLean.
15th	"	"	Rufus Heaton.
16th	"	"	P. H. Cowen.
17th	"	"	John Nellis.
18th	"	"	Seymour Green.
19th	"	"	A. Danforth.
20th	"	"	B. B. Hyde.
21st	"	"	S. S. Burnside.
22d	"	"	Thos. Farrington.
23d	"	"	Beman Brockway.
24th	"	"	C. H. Kingsley.
25th	"	"	Geo. Rathbun.
26th	"	"	G. Bennett.
27th	"	"	S. G. Hadley.
28th	"	"	S. B. Jewett.
29th	"	"	H. Hitchcock.
30th	"	"	Otto F. Marshall.
31st	"	"	T. B. Campbell.
32d	"	"	D. Ewell.
33d	"	"	James R. Doolittle.
34th	"	"	Peter A. Saxe.

Mr. VAN BUREN, from the Committee on that subject, reported for the consideration of the Convention, the following Address, which having been read by him was unanimously adopted:

ADDRESS,

To the Democratic Republican Electors of the State of New York:

FELLOW CITIZENS:—This Convention composed of delegates chosen from the several Assembly districts of the State, called together in pursuance of the uniform usage of the democratic party, having discharged the duty assigned to them by you, deem it appropriate to accompany a report of their proceedings with a simple and candid exposition of their views in regard to some of the great questions which now agitate the country, and of the condition and prospects of the republican party of the State and nation.

This Convention was called by a joint caucus of the democratic members of the Senate and Assembly, for the purpose of determining how delegates should be selected to represent the Democracy of this State in the next National Convention to nominate candidates to be supported by the democracy of the Union for the offices of President and Vice President; and power was given to this Convention, in case it determined that such delegates should be chosen by a State Convention to choose such delegates. The authority under which we are acting is, then, one which you will readily recognise as your legitimate and time-honored agency.

No regular democratic delegated State convention ever assembled in this State under any other authority. Prior to the year 1826, democratic nominations for the State at large were made by Legislative caucuses; in these the counties in which the democrats were in a minority, were unrepresented, and improper influences were often brought to bear to control selections made by those who thus mingled legislative schemes with party nominations, and whose long absence from their constituents had exposed them to the danger of forgetting or misrepresenting their wishes. To obviate these difficulties, and at the same time to secure the co-operation of democratic members of the legislature, who were chosen by their friends as their representatives, by reason of their integrity and ability, and who acted under the responsibility of an official position thus acquired, it was deemed wise, with the general concurrence of the party, that State nominations subsequent to the year alluded to, should be made by State conventions, composed of delegates from every county in the State: but that such conventions should be called by the democratic members of the legislature. In pursuance of this determination, nominations were first made in 1826, by a State convention convened in this manner with the universal assent of the party, and the usage then established has been adhered to unvaryingly to the present day. You will readily remember that every State officer, and every Presidential elector whom you have ever supported since 1826, except the electors chosen by districts in 1828, was put in nomination in this mode The electors of President and Vice-President in this State, prior to the election of 1824, were chosen by the legislature. They were subsequently chosen by the people, in congressional districts; a single election, however, (that of 1828) served to show how entirely the power of New York in a Presidential contest might be prostrated by this mode of choosing Presidential electors. Under it Andrew Jackson obtained twenty electoral votes, and John Quincy Adams sixteen—the effective power of the state thus amounting to four votes, and only equalling that of Rhode Island.

In 1829, the system was therefore abandoned and the system of choosing Presidential electors by general ticket, adopted almost unanimously by the legislature. It is honorable to the citizens of this State, of both political parties, that they united in this measure, and suffered no hope of petty or temporary advantage to stand in the way of their noble determination to preserve unbroken the commanding influence of New York.—Whilst the electors were chosen by districts, they were nominated by district conventions, but ever since they have been chosen by the State at large, they have uniformly been nominated by a State convention, and by the same State convention which nominated the democratic candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor, to be supported at the same election. The delegates to the national nominating convention, however, have always been selected by a State convention, called by the democratic members of the Legislature for the single and express purpose (with two exceptions, to which we shall allude) of choosing such delegates.

Prior to 1832, the democratic candidates for the office of President and Vice-President were selected by a congressional caucus. The first national convention for the purpose assembled in 1832. It nominated Andrew Jackson for President and Martin Van Buren for Vice President. It consisted of delegates chosen by the democracy of each State, in conformity to its own usages, who gave in the convention a vote equal in number to the electoral vote of each State. Some States—Virginia, for instance—sent one hundred or more delegates to give twenty-four votes—the like was true of others. New York, however, sent a number of delegates corresponding with the number of her electoral votes. These delegates were selected by a State convention assembled at Albany, and called by the democratic members of the Senate and Assembly. The mode of selecting these delegates then established, has been pursued uninterruptedly till now. Martin Van Buren was thus nominated for President in 1836, and again in 1840, and James K. Polk in 1844. So firmly was this mode of calling State conventions established as early as 1832, that the *Albany Argus*, a newspaper of position and influence at that time in the republican party, in alluding to the adjourned caucus of the republican members of the legislature, held on the 19th April, 1832, by which a State convention at Herkimer had been called, and the democratic address and resolutions adopted, said:

"The customary recommendation of a State Convention for the nomination of the republican candidates for Governor and Lieut. Governor, and electors of President and Vice President, is in accordance WITH AN ESTABLISHED AND SALUTARY USAGE, and will receive the universal and cordial acquiescence of all the sincere friends of the National and State Administrations. As the deliberations of the Herkimer Convention, from the various candidates for high and responsible stations which it will be required to present for the suffrages of the electors, will be regarded with great interest, so any attempts to forestall the proceedings, *or by partial movements to interrupt the regular action of the republican usages, will assuredly defeat themselves, and bring odium upon their authors*"

We have stated that conventions have been heretofore called for the express purpose, with two exceptions, of choosing delegates to the national convention. The exceptions to which we allude, are the present convention and that of the year 1843. The nomination for the Presidency, in the year 1844, excited intense interest. It was known that the State of New-York presented a citizen of her own as a candidate, and the controlling influence of her delegation in a national convention was dreaded by the friends of the other candidates. A vigorous effort was made to persuade the democracy of New York to depart

om their settled usage, and to select their delegates to a national convention by allowing each congressional district to send one representative. To take the sense of the democratic party in regard to this question, the republican members of the legislature, in April, 1843, called a State convention to assemble in September, 1843, with power to choose delegates to a national convention, or to determine the manner in which they should be chosen. It was wise and magnanimous thus to refer this question to the democracy of the State, and to allow abundant time between the call of the convention and its assembling to discuss it. The convention assembled, and declared by a vote of 103 to 19 in favor of the State system.

In October, 1846, a State convention assembled under the call of the democratic members of the legislature, and nominated Silas Wright for Governor, Addison Gardiner for Lieutenant Governor, and other officers; they also appointed a State central committee to serve for two years, and until another should be chosen. In the spring of 1847, a State convention was called and held in like manner, for the nomination of judical officers; and another in October, 1847, to nominate candidates for the various State offices to be filled at the ensuing November election. These were a Lieutenant Governor, Comptroller, Secretary of State, Attorney General, Treasurer, State Engineer and Surveyor, three State Prison Inspectors, and three Canal Commissioners. A warm and active canvass took place for seats in this last convention. But so far as we have been able to learn, no complaint was then or ever made of the conduct of the State central committee, appointed in 1846, for the ensuing two years, nor was a suggestion made that the convention should in any way interfere with the question of the Presidency of the United States. The public expectation, so far as we know it, awaited at the hands of the convention an avowal of democratic principles, and a nomination of candidates who should be the honest choice of the democratic party for the various State offices we have named. How far their wishes in these respects were met we do not now stop to enquire; but of their action upon subjects not confided to them it becomes our imperative duty to speak. Without authority, and without complaint, they removed the State central committee, whose term was unexpired, and appointed another in its stead. To the entire surprise of those whom they claimed to represent, they clothed the usurping State committee with authority to call State conventions; an authority which, as we have already seen, had been vested in the democratic members of the Legislature for more than twenty years, and ever since the existence of State conventions, and never in a committee; and they assumed to recommend the different congressional districts to send delegates to a national convention, and to deprive the members of the legislature of the power to call a State convention for this purpose, without, so far as we know, the slightest intimation from their constituents that a change in this respect was desired or expected, and in defiance of the well-considered, and mature, and almost unanimous decision of a recent State convention on this very point, called and assembled for the express purpose of determining it. Conduct so unwarrantable produced its natural fruits. The republicans of the State were aroused by usurpations so glaring, and violations of their wishes so unqualified. A mass convention of democrats assembled at Herkimer on the 26th October, 1847, and after declaring the views of those who composed it in regard to great questions of principle, it repudiated the action of the Syracuse convention, declared its proceedings not binding on the democratic party, and called a State convention to assemble at Herkimer, on the 22d February, 1848, to choose thirty-six delegates to represent the democracy of the State in the National nominating convention. We do not stop to discuss the propriety of the action of the Herkimer convention; but it is just to those who participated in it, to state that action correctly.

It was a mass assemblage of Democrats, not a delegated convention. It avowed principles dear to the Democratic party—it nominated no ticket for the support of electors—it imposed no disqualifying tests, and the only step which it took, touching party organization was the call for a State Convention to which we have adverted.—The election followed, and the Democratic party were overwhelmed in a defeat far more disastrous than they had ever before met. Such was the state of things when the Legislature assembled in November, 1847. On the 18th of that month a caucus of the Democratic members was convened under the call of the joint caucus committee. Thirteen Senators and thirty-nine members of Assembly, comprising nearly the entire body of Democratic members of both houses answered to their names. The difficulties in the Democratic party were freely and kindly canvassed at this caucus On the one hand, it was claimed that the Herkimer call for the State Convention was proper and sufficient. On the other, that the change in the mode of choosing delegates proposed at Syracuse would be adopted by the Congressional districts, and that no action ought to be taken by the caucus The discreet and prudent Democrats, however, who were members of the Legislature, chose to take a course which it was supposed would conciliate all interests and disarm all opposition. They followed the precedent of 1843, and by an almost unanimous vote, called the present convention. Instead of calling a convention absolutely to choose delegates as was done at Herkimer, or determining absolutely that they should be chosen by Congressional districts as was done at Syracuse, they called this convention to choose delegates to the national convention, or to determine how they should be chosen. They wisely judged that if the Syracuse Convention had faithfully reflected the popular will, a majority of delegates to this convention would determine in favor of the District System; if, on the other hand, a majority of the Democrats in the State desired to adhere to the former practice, a majority of this convention would so decide, and that in either event, every section and interest in the Democratic party that honestly intended to be governed by the cardinal principle of submission to the will of a majority, fairly and constitutionally expressed, having once an opportunity to be heard, would quietly acquiesce in the proposed arbitrament. A motion to substitute the time

and place named in the Herkimer call was rejected by the caucus. The convention was called at an early day, so that abundant time might remain before the assembling of the national convention to choose delegates to it by districts, if the convention should decide in favor of that mode. An adjourned caucus, equally full, assembled under the call of the committee as published in the Argus on the 13th of December following; an effort was made at this caucus to rescind the call previously made for this convention, which failed by an almost unanimous vote, and the regular address and resolutions reported by the committee appointed for that purpose at the previous caucus, were adopted after a warm discussion, by a vote of twenty-nine to seventeen. The address and resolutions were afterwards signed by a majority of the Democratic members of the Senate and Assembly and published.

The present legislature assembled at Albany on the first Mondey of January last and as no action has been taken by the democratic members in regard to this subject, it is fair to infer that they approved of the conduct of their predecessors. The call of this convention was acquiesced in by those who advocated the Herkimer convention of the 22d, and that convention has been formally and publicly abandoned. We have, therefore, every reason to believe, and do believe, know and declare, that this convention, called in pursuance of established usage, with a view to conciliation and consultation, truly represents no section, clique, or personal interest, but the mass of prudent, impartial, intelligent and disinterested democrats of New York. We have been thus particular in recalling to your attention the usages of the democratic party, and thus minute in explaining the authority under which we act, because we can conceive of no audacity more shameless, or counterfeiting more base, than that of those who would, without warrant, and self constituted, assume to speak to or for you, as your representatives.

In proceeding to the discharge of the trust confided to us, of determining how the delegates to represent you in a national convention ought to be selected, we have referred in the first instance, to the previous usages of the party.—These usages, in subordination to principles, constitute the express law of the party, and an adherence to them has well been termed the sheet-anchor of its safety. They have carried the democracy through the fiercest conflicts, often in victory, and always with honor. We have therefore, supposed that you would not, without good cause, depart from them. We find then, that your invariable usage has been to select delegates to a national convention by a State Convention. This has been done from the first national convention, in 1832, to the last in 1844; and the State convention called in 1843, for the purpose of settling the question, under the full and mature deliberation of which we have spoken, embodying the first ability to be found in your ranks, and the most devoted zeal, and presided over by the Hon. Wm. L. Marcy, came, by a vote of 103 to 19, to the conclusions embodied in the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this convention have duly deliberated on the question of the proper and best mode of appointing the delegates from each state to a national nominating convention, and the number that each state should be entitled to, and we now announce it as the conclusion to which we have arrived, with almost general unanimity, that we believe it most conformable to the principles of the Constitution, and most consistent with the soundest doctrines of the Democratic party, that each State should be entitled to send so many delegates to the Convention as it has electoral votes—that each State ought to appoint its delegates in such way and manner as it shall think proper, and that for other States as well as the State of N. Y., ☞ we think the proper way and manner is to appoint them, not by districts, but by general ticket, and by a State Convention assembled as we are, or in such manner as the democracy may choose to organize their State Convention. And we offer to our constituents and the country, these as some of the main considerations for the conclusion we have announced:—The democratic party owes its existence and success to that jealeus and just fear of the consolidating tendencies of federalism which in the administration of the elder Adams roused the republicans of that pure period, and has ever since maintained the perpetual controversy of parties as to the consolidating or confederating character of the government. To sustain its confederate character, to preserve the rights of the States, and to fortify State action and influence in all its constitutional functions, has been the unchanged creed and unvaried practice of the democratic party. We believe that it would violate that creed and change that practice, to choose delegates by districts, while the electors are chosen by general ticket. We think that delegates to nominate ought to be appointed by the same rule and in the same way as are appointed the electors to elect a President. The President is now chosen by general ticket in each State and each elector votes for the whole electoral ticket, and the State gives her entire vote in the electoral college for one man. In this State we tried the choice of electors by districts, but after the first experiment, and it was seen that the State lost all or much of its influence, it was abandoned by general consent, and the general ticket system adopted in its stead. The nominating convention is organized to enable the people to exercise their constitutional power in the choice of president, and all principle and consistency seem to indicate that he should be nominated as he is elected—each State voting by itself and for itself, and with an undivided vote in both instances. Again, it is important to the democracy of the Union, that the democracy of each State should be kept in the ascendant, and in union and harmony in itself, and it is perhaps undeniable that no party can be long permanent and paramount in the Union, unless it has the support of some or all of the larger States. The presidential question is the great exciting topic of the country, and must be so continually. The smaller states, by size, numbers, identity of interest, and frequency of intercourse, will generally be united in the choice or preference of candidates, and would usually choose the same delegates by districts as by general ticket. But it is not so with the larger States, which the district system would throw into collisions and

dissentions, that would unsettle and distract any party within them. We do not believe that the democratic party could long maintain itself in any of the larger States under the district system, if the federal party in that state adopted the general ticket system. We are aware that a remarkable unanimity pervades the democracy of this State at this time in reference to the choice of Mr. Van Buren as our candidate; and we believe, that if the choice was to be made by districts, that not one district in the state would send a delegate for any other man. But this may never occur again; and that unanimity renders this the more suitable occasion to settle the question in the State. Still more objectionable does the district system appear to us, from the probability that many of the States never can be induced to adopt it, and they will have, from that cause, an undue advantage over the others in every convention. Nor do we see why majorities taken by the states are not as well taken as by districts. It is as often the correct result, and the only mode known in the election of President by the people of the states. That not the smallest objection to the district system would arise from the impracticability of a national convention's intelligently, or satisfactorily, or seasonably settling the questions of contested and double delegations which that system would produce and encourage. And such are some of our reasons for preferring to adhere to the general and united ticket system for each State, as most convenient, fair, equitable, harmonious, constitutional and Democratic."

It gives us great pleasure to concur in the conclusions to which the able and patriotic body that adopted the foregoing resolution arrived. And instead of attempting to add to the reasons so forcibly urged for rejecting the Congressional District System of choosing delegates, we shall merely advert to some of the arguments urged in favor of adopting that system now. One of the arguments is, that the District System has been adopted by other States. This suggestion we believe to be unwarranted by facts. Delegates have already been selected by States in Ohio, Tennessee, Indiana, Georgia, Mississippi, Arkansas and Michigan, and State conventions to choose delegates have been called in Virginia on the 28th of this month, in Pennsylvania on the 4th of next month, and also in Alabama. It will thus be seen that 72, or, including Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Alabama, and excluding New-York, 124 delegates out of 250, may already be deemed chosen by State Conventions. Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont choose a number equal to the delegation in Congress, by Congressional districts; but delegates for the State at large, by State convention. New-Hampshire chooses one delegate by a State Convention and the remainder by Councillor Districts—adding the seven delegates thus chosen by State Conventions, it will be seen that a majority of the delegates to the next national convention, excluding New York, have already in effect been chosen by State Conventions. It is also well known that a majority of the residue have always heretofore been, and doubtless will again be chosen by districts. The great States of Pennsylvania, Ohio and Virginia choose their entire delegations by State Conventions, and so far from finding in the action of other States a reason for departing from previous usages, we see in it additional reason for adhering to our ancient custom. Another argument of the advocates of the district system is that the new Constitution of this State aims to decentralize the power of the State, and that the adoption of the district system would aid this object. In our judgment the decentralization effected by the new Constitution removes the only plausible objection that was ever urged against the State system. There is no central governmental power now to influence the action of a State Convention—and at this moment the democracy are particularly exempt from the remotest influences of this sort. The State officers residing at the seat of goverument are whigs, and the democrats best known, and most conspicuous in the democratic ranks, who have formerly held office are by death, retirement, change of residence, or othe causes, almost without exception, removed even from Albany. Federal patronage only is felt at that point. Whatever danger, therefore, from this cause, may threaten the whig and conservative conventions at Albany, a moment's reflection must satisfy you that to the Democracy it is purely imaginary. A convention like this, chosen by Assembly Districts, and assembled at a distance from the seat of government, can and will select your representatives precisely as directly from the people and as free from central influence, as could possibly be done by a Congressional District Convention. Since the adoption of the new Constitution the patronage of the State Government, if not destroyed, has ceased to be formidable, and the evil of the patronage of the General Government has not only become more prominent by the contrast, but has grown to be a CENTRAL POWER, dangerous to the liberties of the People, and calling loudly for retrenchment and reform.

The only additional suggestion in favor of the district system, is one that always addresses itself with peculiar force to fair-minded democrats, to wit: that as a portion of those with whom we have formerly acted, prefer the district system, it might promote harmony if the majority would yield their rights and preferences, and unite with them. But on such union the seceders have already closed the door by selecting delegates in several of the Congressional Districts before the assembling of this Convention. In the 7th, 13th and 32d Congressional Districts they chose delegates on the 15th of this month. In the 34th on the 12th — In the 3d, 4th and 6th districts, they choose on the 17th instant, and in others they will have chosen before the delegates to this Convention can reach their homes or participate in the selection. This communion of action, therefore, however desirable, has been designedly rendered impossible by those who have refused to submit to the arbitrament of their former associates and themselves.

We have thus far treated this question as it was left by the conciliatory call under which we were convened. But a reference to the proceedings of the democratic electors by whom we were chosen, will show that a vast majority of the conventions which delegated us to carry out their wishes, have expressed their preferences, if not instructed their delegates, in favor of the State system; and believing as we do, that representative fidelity is

the life of our political system, and that the highest obligations of duty and honor require the delegate to obey the expressed wishes of his constituents, we have had no hesitation in proceeding to the choice of 36 delegates to represent you in the National Convention at Baltimore. The individuals selected are believed to be, one and all, eminently trust-worthy; we have not felt at liberty to hamper them with instructions, but entertain the hope that they will carefully ascertain and faithfully carry out your wishes in their conduct. In so doing, they will consult the honor of the State, and the true and permanent interests of the republican party of the State and of the Union, and thus best promote the prosperity and happiness of the American people.

We might here pause: but feeling that we are authorised, under the circumstances, to speak in your behalf, and that a declaration of your views and wishes may not be without service to you and our brethren of the Union, we proceed as briefly as possible, to describe, what we believe to be your principles of action—the condition of the republican party—and the extent and causes of the difficulties that now surround it. New York has no candidate of her own for the Presidency to present to the Democratic National Convention. In the number of her democratic citizens who would do honor to the station, we have not found one who desires to be supported for that high office. Were it otherwise, we are well assured, that not one of them could be designated, that possesses or deserves the confidence of his party, who would permit his success to be accomplished by a suppression, change or qualification of his own opinions or those of his friends, in regard to public measures, or by indirections of any character.

With these remarks, we, under the responsibilities of the trusts reposed in us, and with ample opportunity of information upon the subject, in a spirit of entire candor, declare the following to be a just and faithful exposition of the feelings and opinions of the democracy of New York, upon the subjects which it embraces.

First. Their conviction of the justness of the war, and their determination to sustain the government in an energetic prosecution of it, until a just and honorable peace, the only legitimate object of war, can be obtained, have been sufficiently avowed; and what is of more importance, have been confirmed by their acts at all times and upon all occasions. Having no sinister or selfish objects to be accomplished by it, they will not enter into a competition with others in regard to the vehemence of their asseverations upon the subject of the war. Better justice could not be done to the feelings and dispositions of the democratic masses of this State, than by referring our own government, as well as all concerned, to the late war meeting of the lion-hearted democracy of the city of New York. The spirit and character of that assemblage are well known to the United States Senators, by whom it was addressed. Fervent and impressive, indeed, must have been those proofs of high resolve and ardent patriotism, in view of which the veteran soldier and Senator, Houston, could not refrain from describing it as "the most numerous, the most cheering, and most emboldening meeting which he had ever seen, ever heard of or ever speculated upon seeing." For the sincerity of ninety-nine hundredths of that vast assemblage, this convention can safely vouch, for they are emphatically our brethren in feeling and in principle. Could the true-hearted democracy of the Empire State have been brought together under like circumstances, they would have presented the same appearance, displayed the same feelings, and have pronounced the same noble resolution to defend the rights and honor of the country, at all hazards, and at any sacrifice. Nor would such an exhibition have been more than a renewal of the patriotic feelings and firm resolves with which New York, a frontier State, and compelled for a season to bear the brunt of the contest, met the foe in the war of 1812—feelings which she will never fail to exhibit on all occasion, which are of sufficient magnitude to rouse the potent, though quiet, energies of her democracy.

Secondly. Thus advising the government to an energetic prosecution of the war, until just and honorable terms of peace can be obtained, the democracy of New York deem it due, as well to the administration as to themselves, to state more distinctly than is usual, what those terms ought, in their judgment, to be. To withdraw our troops before indemnity is either made or secured for our just claims against Mexico, and reasonable safe-guards established against future aggression, would be unwise and dishonorable to our country. For the sake of harmony among ourselves, and the better to protect the character of our government against the accustomed reproaches of those who envy, whilst they dread, the force and spread of our institutions, we would prefer to have such indemnity made in some other form than by the cession to the United States of Mexican territory. But we owe it to candor to say, that in the present condition of Mexico it is not possible to expect that this desire can be realized. Viewing the matter in this light, and believing that there are portions of her territory which she can spare without materially weakening her condition, and which it would, in commercial and other points of view, be important that the United States should own, we approve of the efforts of our government to obtain satisfaction for our just claims through that channel, trusting that if such cessions are obtained, they will be acquired upon terms consistent with the character for justice and humanity which we have sustained since our admission into the family of nations. We are opposed to the acquisition by the United States of any considerable extent of territory for any purpose other than its ultimate admission into the Union as States, upon an equal footing with the present members of the confederacy, regarding the colonial system, as we do, to be inconsistent with the genius of our government and dangerous, if adopted, to the perpetuity of our free institutions. Whatever effects upon the population of Mexico, may in the progress of time, be produced by the increased emigration from the United States, to which the present war will inevitably lead, we are at this time wholly unwilling to commit the destinies of this great and flourishing republic to an union with a popu-

lation like that of which six out of eight millions of the present inhabitants of Mexico are composed. Having had no proof of the insincerity of the opinions advanced by the President in his annual message, or any sufficient reason to believe that he has changed his views in regard to it, we hold the alarm which has been sounded in respect to a contemplated denationalization of Mexico by our Government to be without foundation.

Thirdly. The democracy of New York do now, and have always heretofore, believed in the wisdom, humanity and constitutionality of the policy of endeavoring to limit the evils of slavery, by protecting the unsettled territories of the United States, against its introduction, whilst they are under a territorial government. So believing, they will when any such governments are established by Congress, either for the territories we now possess, or for such as we may acquire from Mexico, insist as far as we have the right and the means to do so, that this ancient, successful, and time-honored policy shall be applied to them. And why should we not do so?—What is it that has caused the dissatisfaction with and denunciation which has been so unsparingly poured out upon the democracy of New-York, for steadily pursuing the path which not only they, but, until very recently, the great and good of all parties, have uninterruptedly and happily trod? Apprehensive of the heart burnings and discord which might, in the progress of time arise from the then great and most probably permanent disparity of the condition, in respect to slavery, of the States which had by their joint efforts established our national independence, the patriots of the revolution took early measures to guard, as far as they could, the union of the States against the evils with which they foresaw it would be threatened from this source.

Southern men, whose names are synonymous with all the virtues which can adorn the human character, such as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and a host of other patriots, lent their aid and the influence of their great names to the promotion of this object. When the federal constitution was framed and adopted, Mr. Jefferson was not in the United States—but before he left them, he introduced into Congress the principle which was embodied in the ordinance of 1787, for the government of the Northwestern territory, by which that body, with the declared purpose of "*extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty which form the basis on which these republics, their laws and constitutions are erected;*" provided that there should be "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in said territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been first duly convicted." This ordinance, be it remembered, embraced in its provisions *all the territory which the United States then held in undisputed possession* and in the principal part, if not the whole of it, *slavery was then permitted by law.* This great charter of freedom passed in Congress by the unanimous vote of all the States. The representatives of every Southern State cordially united, and among the great and good men then prominent in the public service, there was not, that we know of, either from the North or the South, the East or the West, but a single dissentient. A slave State made the principle cession of the territory upon which the ordinance was to operate, and Southern statesmen deemed it wise to take the lead in all measures for the melioration and limitation of slavery.

Congress having thus, as they hoped, closed forever the door to the extension of slavery beyond the limits of the original States, all that remained to be done was to prevent its increase by foreign importation. The ground work for the accomplishment of this great object was laid by another body of still higher authority. The convention to frame the present federal constitution was in session when the Jeffersonian ordinance was passed; and it completed the work in which Congress had made so much progress, by two important provisions, viz: one conferring authority on Congress to prohibit the introduction of slaves into the United States from abroad, and the other, in full view of what it had just been doing on the subject of slavery, authorizing it to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory, or other property, belonging to the United States. And among the first acts of the first Congress under the new constitution, composed, in part, of the persons who had framed it, was an act recognizing the validity of the ordinance of 1787. This uniform and harmonious system of action upon the subject of slavery, on the part of the southern statesmen of those days, was not only dictated by the purest and most devoted principles of philanthropy and patriotism, but was well calculated to subserve a policy which they did not attempt to conceal or diguise. They regarded the existence of slavery in the United States as a misfortune of the first magnitude in any aspect in which it could be viewed; a misfortune which could not fail to prove disastrous to the welfare of the whole country; but destined to bear with the greatest severity upon the States of the South, where it prevailed to the greatest extent, and was likely to be permanent. They justly claimed that neither its introduction nor present existence was attributable to them as a fault—that the blame in this respect rested upon the mother country; and so strongly was the leading mind of the South in civil affairs impressed upon this point, that the promotion of the slave trade with the colonies, was one of the charges against Great Britain preferred in the original draft of the declaration of independence. They contended that, as slavery could not now be removed by any known means, it must be tolerated until, in the providence of God, some mode of deliverance was presented, which could not then be devised.

They foresaw, as we have already said, that its existence, when confined to one section of the country, as was likely to be soon the case, might give rise to heartburnings and contention. They met this danger promptly, seasonably, and justly, by showing their willingness to adopt any practicable measure to prevent the increase of an evil, the removal of which was beyond their present power. It mattered not to minds and hearts like theirs, that the territory in respect to which they legislated, was at the time part of slave States, and subject to the introduction of slavery.

Having thus shown their disposition to do all they could upon the subject, and having effected

so much, they felt that they could rely upon the justice, the patriotism, and the fraternal feelings of their sisters of the confederacy, who were, or were soon to become, free States, not only for a total abstinence from interference with the subject in States where slavery existed, but for active aid in the mitigation of its injurious effects. The result has shown that they judged correctly.—Every attempt by the misguided men of the North to disturb the Slave States upon this delicate subject, though vexatious and irritating, has proved substantially harmless. On the other hand, no opinion has become more firmly rooted in the minds and hearts of the Northern people, than that which inculcates the absolute inviolability of the subject of slavery in the States against external interference. Of the extent to which the democracy of New York and their public functionaries have contributed to the maintenance and spread of this sound constitutional doctrine, we need not speak — nor, if our own people are satisfied, as we think they ought to be, that more has not been done in this respect than was required by the constitution, demanded by the comity of States, or due to the fraternal feelings which have so long existed between us and our Southern brethren, will we either relax in our future efforts, or regret the past, in whatever light our conduct may now be viewed by those whom we wished to befriend. The policy thus established by universal consent at the very commencement of the government, and which we desire to uphold, was not only effectual in maintaining harmony between the free and slave States, but it has in other respects been productive of most useful results. It is, beyond all doubt, to its influence and effect alone, that the important and flourishing States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Michigan are at this moment free States; that slavery would otherwise have been diffused thro' the Northwestern territory, and thus have been established in the States alluded to, is certain.

Such were the triumphant results of this wise policy whilst the counsels and opinions of the Washingtons, Jeffersons, and their compatriots prevailed at the south and equally salutary would have been its future fruits had they not been so widely departed from. It seems to be the destiny of this great country that there shall not be a single local interest or feeling that is not made the subject of political and partisan agitation. From the period of the great civil revolution of 1800, when, by the successful efforts of the democracy of this State, the politics of the Union were changed, and the election of Thomas Jefferson secured, to the present day, the democratic party here have had to encounter the vituperation of their opponents in regard to their course upon the slave question. They have been stigmatized as "hewers of wood and drawers of water" to the large slaveholders of the south, because they were willing to sustain not only their political brethren, but the whole people of the south, in the full enjoyment of their constitutional rights. That our political ranks were constantly weakened by a position so liable to perversion, but which a sense of duty compelled us to occupy, is not to be doubted. But the demands that were then made upon us by the South were so just and constitutional that the idea of abandoning our political allies of the South, in this respect, to the assaults of their and our adversaries, never occurred to the single-hearted democracy of the North. While such was the state of things here, it was not possible to make the slave subject a matter of political agitation at the South. However much it might have been desired, the political association which had so long existed between the democratic planters of the South and the sturdy democracy of the North, a party association which had done so much for the advancement of the true principles of the government, could not, in the then state of the slave question, be dissolved. Its future continuance has notwithstanding, been brought in jeopardy—and how has this ominous and baleful change been effected? We need scarcely say that it has been accomplished by an entire revolution in the position of the democracy of the South in regard to the slave question.

The reflecting portion of the people every where were astonished by the advocacy, on the part of men distinguished as well for their great talents as for political and social elevation, of a new creed upon the subject of slavery; a creed widely different from that which was entertained by the founders of the republic, and the fathers of our political church at the South. Instead of regarding slavery as an evil, to be restricted in its spread, as far as that could be constitutionally and justly done, we were called upon to regard it as a blessing which deserved to be perpetuated. Instead of regarding the prevalence of slavery in the progress of the republic as an obstacle to be tolerated, because its removal could not be safely attempted, a claim of favor was set up in its behalf, as constituting the surest basis for free institutions. A reversal of the old policy was of course, demanded by the advocates of this new creed. The success at the South of views so repugnant to the common sense and general feeling of almost all mankind was but little apprehended. But those who regarded it thus lightly when first broached, had formed but imperfect conceptions of the facility with which opinions and measures which are claimed to be for the advancement of local interests, may be promoted by connecting them with party politics. Many who would without hesitation have attempted to arrest it if they were sure that this could be certainly done, fell in with the current as the safest course. Politicians, who are ever on the watch, suffer themselves to be alarmed by their apprehensions that the pioneers of the new faith in the section of country where the feeling prevails, will, by its means, if it is left to their sole direction, supplant, in the public counsels, those who dissent or doubt. How far the doctrine to which we refer is indebted to this source for its success in the South we cannot know, and do not undertake to determine. Certain it is, that its progress in the slave States has been sufficient to give rise to the present demand for the extension of slavery to territories where it does not now exist.

It is by no means our intention or desire to arraign the free citizens of the south for originating or for giving in their adhesion to these extraordinary views upon the subject of slavery. They may have been able to satisfy themselves that the ag-

gressive position upon the subject is better than the defensive and that they have been right in assuming it. Claiming in its plenitude the right of self-judgment for ourselves, we cheerfully award it to them; and it is doing great injustice to the democracy of New York, to suppose that the difference in opinion which has of late arisen between their old and long tried political friends and themselves, has in the least degree affected our feelings towards them. No such change has occurred. We, on the contrary look back with pleasure to the many political battles which we have fought and won in conjunction with them; to the advance which the true principles of our government have received from the exertion of our joint forces. We are sincerely desirous to continue the same party co-operation with them, so long as this can be done without individual or sectional degradation.

But to demand of the citizens of this great State that after we have, by seasonable action, and what was at the time, though erroneously, regarded as a great sacrifice, succeeded in abolishing slavery from its borders, they should at this day, in the middle of the 19th century, in full view of the improved opinion of almost all mankind upon the subject—of the inestimable and incalculable advantage in the increase and prosperity of our State in no small degree attributable to this very exemption,—make themselves parties, either expressly or virtually, by action or inaction, to the original institution of slavery by force in territories which are now exempt from it, is most unreasonable indeed.

It is what we are persuaded that no enlightened or candid man at the South can possibly expect at our hands, however plausible the pretences are on which the sacrifice is asked, and for making which, upon the impulse of a desire for political promotion, they could not fail to despise us.

Fourthly. Although such are the opinions we entertain upon this important question, and which we feel it to be a conscientious duty to maintain to the utmost, unless convinced of their injustice and unconstitutionality, we have never sought to impose them upon others; still less have we made an acquiescence in our views of the subject a controlling test in an election, as has been unjustly charged upon us. The annals of our party proceedings may be safely challenged for the proof that any such test has been advocated by us. We have neither made such a test, nor will we submit to it when made by others; nor can the democratic masses of this State be induced to sustain those who do either.

Have our dissenting friends acted in a spirit equally conciliatory and forbearing? After what has been said in respect to interpolations upon the democratic creed by the democracy of New York, it is due to them, to their determined and disinterested devotion to the cause and to truth, that this matter should be set right. Not to deal in general allegations, always so unsatisfactory, and to enable our statement to be refuted if it be incorrect, we will confine ourselves principally to the acts of a single State. We take that of the highly respectable and patriotic State of Georgia.

No one, we are confident, supposes that in making this selection, we are, in any degree, influenced by prejudice or unkind feelings of any description. Every one conversant with our political history for the last quarter of a century, knows that during that period there has been an almost unbroken sympathy of feeling between her democratic citizens and those of New York.—These feelings are not, on our part, in the least diminished. The sacrifices which the democracy of New York have incurred in supporting the particular wishes and interests of Georgia, have been of no ordinary character. It is well known to the men of that day, that by their efforts to elevate Georgia's favorite son to the Presidency, they drew upon their party the most signal overthrow in our state politics it had ever sustained, a defeat which it took years of patient toil and sacrifice to overcome—that this had scarcely been accomplished, and our wonted ascendancy in the State re-established, when the long pending contest between Georgia and the Indian tribes within her borders, arrived at its crisis. The extent to which it became connected with party politics, and interwoven with the religious feelings of our community, in consequence of the imprisonment of the missionaries, is also known. But the losses which the democratic party of this State sustained by the part they took in that agitating controversy, are not so well known, or may have been forgotton. Believing Georgia to be right, the democracy of this State threw themselves fearlessly into the contest, and sustained her side of the question through one of the fiercest, and for a long time, most doubtful canvasses they had ever encountered. It is not too much to say, that the democratic party of this State sustained a permanent loss of 20,000 votes by the part they took on that question. An occasion is approaching, in which the democracy of New York will be called to act in concert with their political brethren in other States, in the selection and election of candidates for the highest offices under the government.—They enter upon the performance of these important duties under peculiar circumstances. Believing themselves to be right, they have long since taken their stand in favor of the exclusion of slavery from the present and future territories of the United States in which it does not now exist. In the justice and constitutionality of this principle, as has long since been known through the length and breadth of the land, there is a unanimity of opinion among her citizens of all classes, sects and parties, which has scarcely, if ever, been equalled. Her representatives in Congress, thirty-four in number—differing upon almost all other subjects—had voted in favor of this principle, with but one exception. Her legislators have been neither less prompt nor less united in similar expressions of opinion; and the only qualification of the general voice was in the miserable attempts of a very small number, who, though they dare not openly avow their hostility to the principle, still endeavored to screen iheir refusal to support it, by a resort to evasions and equivocations of the lowest character.

It is now known that the Democracy of New York have no candidate to present for the Presidency. But for reasons which need not be stated, it was then neither unreasonable nor im-

probable that she might have one, whose views on all public questions were well understood.—It was under such circumstances that the democracy of Georgia, which State has never yet from the establishment of the Government to the present day, cast her vote for a northern democrat for the Presidency, felt themselves called upon to declare, in their State Convention, that they would never support any man for the Presidency who did not come forward and solemnly disavow the principle around which the whole People of New York had rallied with such extraordinary unanimity. The same unchangeable determination was, at a subsequent period, reaffirmed by the Legislature of Georgia, and inscribed on the public and permanent archives of the State. Proceedings similar in principle, though not, perhaps, in their extent, were had in the States of Virginia and Alabama, between whom and the democracy of New York the same friendly relations have existed, though our claims upon their forbearance may not be as strong. Now, we are unwilling to believe that the highly respectable parties to these proceedings can possibly entertain so low an opinion of the democratic citizens of New York as to suppose them capable of thus qualifying themselves for their support. They cannot, we are sure, believe them such slaves to the lust of office as to suppose that in view of the disfranchising and ostracizing resolutions to which we have referred, and with a full knowledge that the State of which they have the high honor to be citizens, is almost as one man in opposition to it, they could, whatever their own opinion of the principle might be, for any earthly consideration, stoop so low as to take the pledge so imperatively demanded, and thereby subject their name to a load of obloquy over which the waters of forgetfulness would roll in vain. If we are right in this, as we cannot but be, then in what other light can we regard these exciting resolutions, than as so many decrees that unless the State of New York will openly retract opinions which it is well known she has deliberately formed and repeatedly expressed, upon a public question of vital importance, her sons shall henceforth be excluded from the honors of the republic? Such a test may be imposed on the democratic candidate for the Presidency; the citizens of New York may be thus ostracized—its representatives in Congress and in the legislative halls, its presses, public speakers, and even electors debarred from participating in the canvass, and the State thus surrendered to our political opponents; but we should be unmindful of our high trust, and unjust to our brethren of the Union, if, knowing the sentiments of northern freemen, we did not now declare that any candidate for the Presidency, presented upon such principles, and qualified by the degrading submission they seem to require, must inevitably meet with defeat and disgrace.

Fifthly. Whilst we have witnessed with feelings of respect and gratitude, the solicitude evinced by our friends in other States in regard to the schism which has existed, and does still, to a limited extent, exist in the Democratic party of this State, we have seen, on the other hand, with mortification and regret the unjust and unfounded opinions promulgated upon the subject in quarters from which we had a right to expect more correct views. It is due to all concerned, that the causes of that schism should be truly and explicitly stated. We shall do this with the frankness that we intend shall distinguish all the proceedings of this Convention.

There has scarcely ever been a period in the history of our party when it presented so formidable a front to its opponents as in the winter of 1843, and the spring of 1844. Guided by the counsels of men who, by lives of political probity and consistency, had earned its entire confidence and warm affections, and its masses perfectly united on their candidate for the Presidency, there was no calculation upon its efficiency that seemed extravagant. Officers of the General Government were indeed posted in the lobbies of the legislature seeking to create distraction, and to prevent that body from reflecting the wishes of their constituents—officers and emissaries who are still at the same work, and not a few of whom, we are sorry to say, are still basking in the sunshine of Federal patronage. Their efforts were, however, without avail, and the legislature broke up with an expression of opinion which reflected the will of their constituents, and was adopted with unusual unanimity. The Baltimore Convention followed, and of its results and proceedings we need only say that they came upon the Democratic party of this State with an effect at once astounding and disqualifying. Two opinions rose promptly and spontaneously to the minds of all reflecting men, and those were 1st: That the election would, in all probability, be controlled by the vote of this State—and 2d: That that vote could only be secured to Mr. Polk by the nomination for Governor of the ever lamented Statesman, Silas Wright. The prominent men of the party, notwithstanding the keenness of their disappointment and their dissatisfaction at the means by which their wishes had been defeated, did not hesitate a moment in stepping forward to rescue, as they then supposed the democratic party from the dangers that surrounded it. To bring about the desired nomination for Governor it was for some time deemed indispensable that the highly respectable citizen who then occupied the Executive chair and is now the incumbent of the most responsible office in this State by the appointment of President Polk, should be prevailed upon to decline a re-nomination. This he refused to do. It is known to many that the enjoyment of the office of Governor in whatever form conferred, was as opposite to Mr. Wright's wishes, as his friends knew it to be adverse to his interests, but only an actual observer could appreciate the aversion with which he contemplated the use of his name for the defeat of Gov. Bouck's re-nomination, in case Gov. B. desired a re-nomination, or the unfeigned regret with which he finally bowed to the mandate of his party. The fact of his nomination and the consequent success of President Polk are known to all.

There is in all parties a band of dissatisfied men secretly hostile to the powers they profess to support. Mr. Wright's administration commenced in January, 1845, and that of Mr. Polk in March. The class of men to which we have alluded was in this State powerless of itself. But there was at this time another composed of able men whose

relations to the democratic party were less impaired, and who constituted an important part of the State Senate. They were deeply dissatisfied at the displacement of Gov. Bouck; to some it was a disappointment of cherished schemes of personal aggrandizement, and to others it was offensive as a mortification of an amiable citizen for whom they had a warm regard. The former were unavoidably hostile and the latter might become so in a certarn event—together they were capable from their ability, experience and official position, of seriously obstructing the State administration, and distracting the party. In the few months that intervened between the commencement of the State and National administrations, everything was smooth upon the surface of these elements of discontent. All reflecting men saw that the future cordial support of the State administration, and the consequent harmony of the party, depended upon the President's selection of the representative of the New York democracy in his cabinet. If it was such as to give assurance that opposition to Mr. WRIGHT would be frowned down at Washington, tranquillity was assured—if the reverse, materials of discontent only awaited encuragement from abroad to take the form of a third party in the State.

The selection of the individual who was to speak the opinions and wishes of the democracy of New-York, in Mr. Polk's cabinet, was finally made; and the effect it produced on those here who had been made hostile to Gov. Wright by the sacrifice he had made of himself, and of his fondest desires, to secure the election of the democratic ticket, was instantaneous, universal, and most decisive. The belief that Governor Wright would be the man to whom the democracy of this state and of the Union, would look at the next Presidential election to redress the injustice which had recently been done to her, was general. Although placed in this attitude, without any agency of his own, it very readily occurred to the sagacious malcontents at Albany, that every rival-aspirant would exert his energies, to weaken Mr. Wright's position, and impair the weight in the national scale of a state which had just given such a striking proof of its great capacity and irrepressible energies. However erroneous this conclusion may have been, its full adoption by them is very certain, and the immediate consequence was a virtual severance of themselves from the friends of the State administration, and concealed, but not the less active opposition to its measures, with unceasing hostility to Gov. Wright, and determined opposition to his future advancement—all looking to an ultimate organization as a separate faction if they should fail in getting possession of the democratic party of the state. Nothing which Gov. Wright could have done consistent with the faithful performance of his official duties, could have shaken, much less overcome, these resolutions. In this way, and from such impulses, arose the Conservative faction, in this State—a faction which secretly or openly opposed the administration of Gov. Wright through its whole course; embittered the life, and by secret intrigues, defeated the re-election of that great and good man, and which after his death succeeded at Syracuse, as it supposed, in advancing the object for which it was originally organized, viz: the prostration of the consolidated and rightful influence of this great state with the democracy of the Union. This faction soon learned that in the democratic party it was powerless. So early as the spring of 1846, therefore, it organized itself in the county of Albany into a separate party to which not only all the officers of the general government residing in that county, and the intimate friends of the Secretary at War belonged, but which was notoriously created, and directed by, and almost wholly constituted of, such officers and friends. The pretended regularity of this organization was submitted to the State Convention which nominated Silas Wright in 1846, and declared spurious. Refusing to abide the arbitrament they had invoked, its members not only maintained their organization but by subsequent inflammatory appeals to the democracy at public meetings, and through the press, up to the very moment of the fall election, rolled up an unprecedented majority of 2,800 against Gov Wright in the county of Albany, and ensured his defeat in the State. Their labors did not end here. Delegates from this spurious organization were sent to the Judicial State Convention in the spring of 1847, and again pronounced counterfeit. In steady prosecution of the original object, efforts were then made to extend this irregular organization to the rest of the State, and to combine it at the Capitol. The original conspirators and their friends accordingly assembled, on the 26th of last month, at the seat of the conspiracy, and the theatre of its first exhibition, under circumstances of imposition and audacity never even approached in the annals of our party warfare, and have undertaken to perfect their organization throughout the State, and to speak to you, and to our political brethern throughout the Union in your name. Bolting from the democratic party which has imposed no tests, and covering their defection under the false charge that it has, they ally themselves with a Southern and slaveholding faction which demands of the democratic candidate for the Presidency, as a qualifying test, a renunciation of the cause of human freedom. Committed in every form of speech, writing and action, to your established usages of choosing delegates to a National convention by a State convention, and of calling State conventions by Legislative caucuses, they secede from your ranks because instead of submitting to the Syracuse usurpations you ask and exercise the privilege of determining for yourselves whether these usages shall be changed.—Nurtured and fed, if not begotten at Washington, and assembling at the capital of the State, under the call of a central committee which overrides all local organization, they declaimed against an extinct central power, which lives only in the memory of the abuses they themselves perpetrated by it. Leading, active notorious and unyielding opponents of the call for a Convention and the new Constitution which swept away these abuses, they boldly assume the inception of the movement out of which these salutary reforms grew. Rich, swollen and glutted with the profits of Bank Stock, Public Printing, and Domestic Manufactures, they shout against Banks, Monopolies and Special Legisla-

tion, and hurrah for Free Trade, which they lobbied to defeat, with a strength, confidence, and apparent ardor that render the original and consistent opponents of all these great abuses, and of the Tariff of 1842, inaudible if not imperceptible. Prominent, conspicuous, and odious members of the only Regency ever described by the Whigs, they turn upon themselves with a fierceness and fatal precision that would be certain suicide, if they were politically alive. But we forbear further comment on inconsistencies so glaring and transparent.

Pretences, futile in their nature or false in fact, to excuse their opposition to Gov. Wright, on the ground of his own acts, have been and will continue to be resorted to, but whatever may be the case with those who are remote from the scene of action, no honest man here who knows the parties, or has witnessed the transactions to which we have referred, will, for a moment hesitate in giving to the motives, objects, and creation of this faction, the character we have ascribed to it. The correctness of the interpretation of the feelings and wishes of the Federal Administration which this faction so decidedly adopted, and have ever since most unhesitatingly continued to act upon, it is not our present purpose to determine. We are aware that its accuracy is denied by those who are the best judges of their real wishes and intentions We are content to leave the validity of that denial to the unbiassed judgement of those interested. Should any circumstances arise which make the avowal of our own opinion upon the point important or necessary, to the vindication of any course we may find it necessary to pursue, that opinion, with the reasons upon which it is founded, shall be unreservedly given To the present explanation this is not necessary.

Among the friends of Gov. Wright whom he thought deserving of a place in the National Cabinet, there was not a single one by whom its acceptance would not have been regarded as a sacrifice of personal feeling and interest, or who could have been induced to accept it from any other motive than a sense of public duty. The official favors of the President might have been scattered through the State with a discernible bias in favor of the opponents of the State Administration, without the slightest danger of a serious rupture in the party. Here and there he might have met with an indignant remonstrance, but its effects would have been limited and temporary, for it is justly due to the sterling democracy of New York, whatever those who choose to underrate its patriotism may speak or think of them, to say, that upon its masses the patronage of no government can make the least impression. If proof of this be required, we have only to refer to the present condition of the democracy of the cities of New York and Buffalo, and the manner in which they are known to have been treated in this respect. Private griefs on the part of the democratic party, or of any of its prominent members, have therefore had nothing to do in producing the present state of things. The evil under which we have suffered, is the deliberate formation of a faction by the means we have described, in what was once the democratic ranks, and which seeks the prostration of the political influence of this State before that of its peers in the confederacy—a faction which was engendered by the conviction that it would receive aid and comfort from without, and which is alone sustained by the impression, whether well or ill founded, that its members are the favorites here of the General Administration. If asked how long this state of things is to continue, we can only say, put the same question to any sensible man you meet with here, whether he believes that the faction represented by the recent Convention at Albany, or the individuals who composed it, would with the knowledge they possess of their present condition in the State, continue their disorganizing and distracting schemes, if they were confident that it would injure their influence and standing with the General Administration, and in ninety-nine out of a hundred cases, he would unhesitatingly say, "No, by no means"—and such is also our own opinion.—There are doubtless many honest men yet allied to this faction, although their numbers are diminishing with unprecedented dispatch. But the leaders who originally formed and still direct its course, are among the most experienced and cunning tacticians in the State, who quickly understand when there is a desire that they should do so. Let them be made to know that the stupendous fraud they are concocting to neutralize the influence of this State in National politics, will be remembered to their disadvantage at the seat of power, and we will vouch for it, that within one month, the democratic party of this State will be restored to tranquility, and the efficiency which it possessed before the, to it, disastrous campaign of 1844, be speedily revived.

Fellow citizens: Having thus to you, or in your name, expressed the sentiments in regard to national affairs which we deem the occasion demands, let us briefly call your attention to the position and history of our State politics. The first reflection that naturally rises in this connection to the mind of one familiar with the relation New York has borne to the Union, (aside from the establishment of principles,) is a recollection of the vast disproportion between the honest aid our democracy have given to the democratic party of the Union and the returns that have been made. From the great overthrow of federalism in 1800, until the final contest of 1844, the democracy of New York have been true in their allegiance to their brethren of the Union, and their strong arm has generally given the victory to the democratic cause; and yet during that long period, how rare have been the instances when, from some undefinable cause, influence at Washington was not wholly wielded by citizens of our State, destitute of standing or weight at home? Yet this mortifying experience will not be without its use, if it teaches those who take a higher and deeper interest in political action than the love of office can inspire, the undeniable truth that our own State presents a field of political progress far more encouraging and worthy of improvement, than that to which their attention has been, heretofore, so largely directed. With a population outnumbering that of many European nations—identified in feeling and interest to a degree far exceeding those of the Union—rich, prosperous, and free—an opportunity is here pre-

sented to advance the true principles of civil government abundantly adequate to satistify a reasonable ambition. The democratic fabric, indeed, is at present in ruins—prostrated by the great victory of 1841—but we are used to adversity, and schooled in its uses. All that the indomitable democracy of New York want, to enable them to rise with renewed vigor and strength from their fall, is a fair field, and no false friends. History is philosophy teaching by example, and of all history that of the democratic party of New York is most instructive in this wise. Springing from the revolutionary war, and connected with the feuds that had arisen in the fierce civil contests between the great families of the State, it became, in no small degree, the sharer of struggles in which personal feelings, friendships, and antipathies had as much, if not greater weight, than a desire for the establishment of just and wise political principles.

Many views which could not now be regarded as in any sense liberal were still adhered to, because they were in favor under the monarchy, and had formed no part of the issues which had produced the war. But the glorious spirit which gave rise to the revolution, and which is, by its nature, at war with all abuses in government, constituted the corner stone of what was first the whig, then the anti-federal, afterwards the republican, and now the democratic party. Its workings were embarrassed and its advance obstructed by old associations and unwise habits of thinking on the part of many of its most zealous advocates; but it worked on. Slow at first, it has nevertheless developed, is now developing, and will continue to develope its powers until our political regeneration is as complete as the most ardent friends of the rights of man could desire. Even a rapid review of our party history through the long lapse of years that has intervened since its formation, cannot fail to prove instructive, especially at a moment like the present. Powerful as it has been, and can be again, no adequate opportunity for the display of the benificent effects which the spread of its principles is capable of producing, has yet been afforded.

The attention of our leading politicians has been too much diverted by temptations from abroad, a tendency to which we desire to fix more reasonable limits for the future. In seeing what has already been accomplished, we may infer what may hereafter be effected by a steady and disinterested perseverance in enlightened and virtuous political action.

The obstacles, which have for such a series of years, retarded the advance of the principles which should govern a party that is democratic in its faith, as well as in its name, are:—

First. Its connexion with the banking system of the State. Hosts of our firmest friends have been seduced by the temptation of being able by its means to live without labor, and have been rendered, through its influence, disloyal to their professed principles, and have, for the most part, become in the end, alike uselesss as well to their party, as to themselves. We, by this connexion also made our party responsible for the extent to which the representative system was degraded by legislative corruptions, through bank influence, and for the plunder of the working classes by the banks themselves, through a worthless paper circulation. It was difficult for the masses to retain confidence in professed democrats who became parties to such schemes, and our cause suffered through their venality, or indiscretion, or both.

Secondly. The support for so long a period given by the democratic party to the protective policy in the extent to which it was carried, has been another source of weakness; the truth now so prevalent, that under the fraudulent disguise of an intention to promote the prosperity of the farming and mechanic classes, were concealed by the initiated the design and effect of making the rich richer and the poor poorer, was well understood by the democratic masses before it was appreciated by their leaders. The numerous princely fortunes which have within a few years been accumulated by the favored few, whilst the business operations of all other classes were unproductive, have at last opened the eyes of all unprejudiced observers.

Thirdly. The concentration of the power of appointment to office at the seat of government was for a long time a prolific source of popular distrust and discredit. Springing from an undeserved distrust of either the intelligence or honesty of the people—its existence was a cause of offence to them, whilst it afforded to the intriguing politician and the venal courtier rewards and honors, which, under wiser regulations, would have been given to the virtuous and deserving citizen.

Fourthly. Special and exclusive legislation, one of the worst and most dangerous abuses of political power, flourished almost as much under a nominally democratic as under federal sway.

Fifthly. Appearances, false in fact, but plausible in their nature, have for a succession of years exposed the democratic party of this State to the imputation of being the abettors of human slavery. The vulnerable character of its condition in this respect has, of course, not been left unimproved by our opponents, and year after year has this consideration deprived us of thousands of friends who, before this delusion took possession of them, were sincere, intelligent, and devoted democrats; but who, finally, sank into the fanatical ranks of abolitionism.

These counteracting elements, and others that might be adverted to, have been constantly at work to retard the onward march of the democratic party. But how successfully have they been met and overcome by the spirit of liberty which gave it birth and watches over its growth. Two successive new constitutions have been framed and adopted—the scramble for bank charters no longer disgraces our halls of legislation—trade is freed by the Democracy of the Union, from the shackles which bound it, and the treasury of the people declared and made independent—the centralization of power at the capital is destroyed—special privileges and immunities have given place to acts of general legislation. By a fortunate accident, or a special providence, the assumption by slaveholders of a new and indefensible position on the subject of slavery, has enabled democrats to stand forth in their natural and true attitude, as the champions of human freedom; and

better, far better, than all or either, the advocates and beneficiaries of all these abuses and obstructions, have formally, and in a body, abandoned the democratic party and set up for themselves. Of all the displays which the vital principle of freedom has exhibited, the last is the most striking and grateful. The democratic party of New York moves on without the fetters upon its action that selfish and sinister influences have hitherto imposed. It invites to its ranks the just, and virtuous, and true. It will welcome them to a standard which is unfurled, after rare defeats, with redoubled energy, and the hope of more enduring ascendancy. On it are inscribed "Free Trade, Free Labor, Free Soil, Free Speech, and Free Men."

A brilliant future opens upon our prospect. A convention to frame a new constitution—the cherished object of a long struggle—eventually obtained the support of a vast majority of the electors of New York. The new constitution to which it gave birth, secured most of the valuable reforms for which true democrats labored, and became the organic law of the State, with the hearty assent of the people. The war in which we are now engaged, commands the support of all true patriots, and in this State, notoriously, is not the subject of party division.—The sacred principle of consecrating free soil to freedom, enlists the warm support of our electors, with insignificant exceptions. The great principles of the democratic faith, having thus secured a warm and generous approval, the measures to give them practical application having thus signally triumphed, who ventures to doubt that on the first presentation hereafter of the great principles of Democracy in the persons of candidates truly representing them, the freemen, of this State will, with their accustomed power and fidelity, incline victory to the democratic standard? We should gladly unite with our brethren of other States, where union is practicable, upon just and honorable terms; but without their assistance, our unaided energies can secure to the democratic party a dominion, which for extent, resources, cultivation, and enlightened constitutional liberty, may well be styled an Empire of Freedom.

Messrs. RATHBUN, of Cayuga, and NYE, of Madison, then addressed the Convention, after which it adjourned to 10 o'clock to-morrow morning

—

THURSDAY.

The Convention met pursuant to adjournment, when Mr. DOOLITTLE, from the committee for that purpose reported a series of resolutions After a discussion in which Messrs. COLVIN and VAN BUREN, of Albany, HULBURT, of Oneida, WATERBURY, of New York, and DOOLITTLE, of Wyoming participated, the resolutions were, with some amendment, unanimously adopted, as follows:

Resolutions.

Resolved, That the Democracy of the State of New York hold to a strict construction of the Constitution of the United States and of this State; the independent sovereignty of the several States in all their reserved rights; eternal vigilance against any encroachment by the General Government upon the rights of the States, or by the State upon the equal and natural rights of the individual; free labor, free soil and free trade; freedom from public debt; freedom of worship; freedom of speech and freedom of the press: An Independent Treasury; a revenue tariff, at present, to meet the ordinary expenses of the government; no distribution of the proceeds of the public lands among the States, and no monopoly thereof by land speculators;—peace with all the world, so long as it can be maintained without a sacrifice of national character; a vigorous prosecution of the existing war with Mexico, until we obtain an honorable peace upon a just and sufficient indemnity: and that they desire the preservation of the nationality of Mexico, and no incorporation of its populous states as a part of the American nation; and are prepared to resist the introduction of the European doctrine of the balance of power upon the North American continent, cost what it may, of treasure or of blood.

Resolved, That a public debt is the strong fortress behind which the money power securely raises itself to the supremacy in the State, and wields a sceptre more potent for mischief, because unseen, than the sceptre of kings over the interests of the public; that the republican system, though existing in form, becomes a mockery and a delusion when the agents of the people, in the Halls of Legislation or in the Cabinet, are subjected to the influence of the Money Power, whether it be in the form of corporate usurpation, profusion of expenditure, or a Government Exchequer; and that we have witnessed with profound gratification the efforts of the people of this and other States to stay, by the interposition of constitutional barriers, the further progress of this dangerous usurpation of the rights of the people to self-government.

Resolved, That the measures of the General Government calculated and designed to establish commercial freedom, equal taxation and the constitutional currency of gold and silver, are entitled to the strong and abiding approval of the Democracy of this State and Nation.

Resolved, That these measures of salutary reform should not only be maintained by the best efforts of the democracy, but others proposed and carried out, which shall secure a retrenchment of the expenses and patronage of the Federal Government, the abolition of all unnecessary offices and salaries, and the exercise by the people of the right of electing all local officers in the service of that Government, so far as the same may be practicable.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention, it is the duty of Congress, during its present session, to provide a territorial Government for the people of Oregon, and to organize such other territorial Governments as are necessary to protect the rights of the American citizen, who has abandoned the home and friends of his youth to

conquer the wilderness of the Far West, and carve out inheritances for the rising generation.

Resolved, That while the democracy of New York, represented in this Convention, will faithfully adhere to all the compromises of the Constitution and maintain all the reserved rights of the States, they declare, since the crisis has arrived when that question must be met, their uncompromising hostility to the extension of slavery into territory now free, which may be hereafter acquired, by any action of the Government of the United States.

Whereas, The President of the United States in his last annual message, has recommended the establishment by Congress of Territorial Governments over the conquered Mexican provinces of New Mexico and California, and the retention thereof as an indemnity; in which said territories the institution of slavery does not now exist, therefore,

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use their best efforts to insert into any act or ordinance, establishing any and all such provisional or territorial government or governments, a fundamental article or provision which shall provide, declare and guaranty, that slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been first duly convicted, shall be prohibited therein so long as the same shall remain a territory.

Resolved, That while the Democracy of New York feel called upon by their regard for principle and a conviction of duty to reiterate this emphatic declaration of their sentiments and wishes, they have not now, nor have they ever had, any desire to prescribe a test in the Presidential canvass which might prevent the union of all who sustain the general principles of the democratic creed; and that they deeply regret that any of their Southern brethren should have unwisely laid down a platform inconsistent with that union and inevitably tending to break up a national party into sectional divisions.

Resolved, That the distinguished purity, the unselfish fidelity, the noble sense of honor, and the superior mental qualities, with the many other excellencies of the late SILAS WRIGHT, presenting in his character a combination of moral worth and intellectual power unexcelled in the elements of true greatness, and of which every particular united in singular harmony to increase the admirable beauty of the whole, as well as his long course of high public service, and the patriotic zeal and devotion which marked it, are richly deserving of the love, gratitude and respect of the people to whose service he gave his life.

Resolved, That the death of GEORGE P. BARKER, the late Attorney General of this State, is an event of the most afflicting nature, and calls for the warm expression by this Convention of its respect for his memory, and sympathy with all to whom he was near and dear; and that by his death the State has lost one of its most promising and talented citizens, Society one of its highest and most cherished ornaments, and the Democratic Cause one of its most able, vigorous, sincere and devoted supporters.

Resolved, That this Convention will not withhold the expression of its confidence in the civil wisdom and public and private virtues of THOMAS H. BENTON of Missouri. By his powerful and uniform support of the principles of Jeffersonian Democracy throughout a long and illustrious Senatorial career, characterized by unparalleled industry and devotion to the interests of the country, he has won a proud pre-eminence among the statesmen of his day, and endeared himself to the masses of the American Democracy.

Resolved, That the Hon. JOHN A. DIX, of the Senate of the United States, by his high and noble bearing in that distinguished body, has become justly endeared to the democratic party in this State and throughout the Union, and we rejoice in him as a most worthy successor of the late lamented Silas Wright.

Resolved, That Major Gen'l ZACHARY TAYLOR, by his masterly correspondence with the War Department, no less than by his heroic conduct and indomitable coolness and courage on the field of battle, has shown himself to be, not only a distinguished military chieftain, but a man of great mental and moral power, and whose whole life has given evidence of a strong head, an honest heart and a republican simplicity of character.

Resolved, That the achievements of our armies in Mexico, have proved the extraordinary military skill and intelligence of their officers, and the indomitable valor of the common soldier, both regular and volunteer, and have added imperishable lustre to our fame in arms.

Resolved, That we recognize the State Central Committee duly appointed for the term of two years, by the Democratic State Convention held at Syracuse on the first day of October, 1846, as being still the State Central Committee of the Democratic party of this State.

Resolved, That this Convention are in favor of and recommend the holding of a Democratic State Convention, to be composed of one delegate from each Assembly district, for the purpose of nominating candidates for Electors of President and Vice President, and for such State officers as are to be chosen by General Ticket at the next fall election.

Resolved, That this Convention are in favor of and recommend the calling of such Democratic State Convention by the Democratic members of the Legislature, according to the uniform democratic usage; but, in case they should omit to make such call, we recommend that the Democracy of the State meet in convention to take such measures as may be necessary to avert the danger of being without candidates for their suffrages which will then have arisen, and that the State Central Committee designate a time and place for the assembling of such Convention.

Mr. BOCKEE, from the committee of thirty-four appointed for that purpose, reported the following as Delegates, and their alternates, to represent the Democracy of New York in the National Convention to be held at Baltimore in May next:—

STATE AT LARGE.

Delegates.	*Alternates.*
C. C. CAMBRELENG,	ANDREW H. MICKLE
JARED WILSON,	ALBERT LESTER.

Dist.	CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS.	
1,	PLATT WILLETTS,	SAMUEL PHILIPS.
2,	MINTH'E TOMPKINS,	SAMUEL E. JOHNSON.
3,	JOHN A. KENNEDY,	GEORGE H. PURSER.
4,	ROBT. H. MACLAY,	ELIJAH F. PURDY.
5,	W.F. HAVEMEYER,	MARK SPENCER.
6,	SAM'L J. TILDEN,	AMOS F. HATFIELD.
7,	RAY TOMPKINS,	JOHN C. BLAUVELT.
8,	GOV'NEUR KEMBLE,	HENRY DOWNING.
9,	ROBT. DENNISTON,	MERRIT H. CASH.
10,	JON. D.OSTRANDER,	RODNEY A. CHIPP.
11,	JNO. P. BEEKMAN,	JAMES POWERS.
12,	JOHN J. VIELE,	REILLY LOOMIS.
13,	NICHOLAS HILL, Jr.,	PETER CAGGER.
14,	COR. L. ALLEN,	JAMES S. WHALLON.
15,	AMOS A. PRESCOTT,	WALTER GEER.
16,	PLATT POTTER,	ABRAHAM Y.LANSING
17,	WM. C. CRAIN,	ARPHAXED LOOMIS.
18,	PRESTON KING,	WILLIAM COLLINS.
19,	A. S. GREEN,	JAMES F STARBUCK.
20,	WARD HUNT,	JOHN DEAN.
21,	L. J. WALWORTH,	DAVID ELDRIDGE.
22,	OLIV'R C CROCKER,	RICHARD H. SACKETT.
23,	JAMES W. NYE,	LEANDER BABCOCK.
24,	WILLIAM FULLER,	HORACE WHEATON.
25,	THOS. Y. HOW, Jr.,	DANIEL H. TITUS.
26,	JNO. W. WISNER,	RICH'D H. WILLIAMS.
27,	JAMES C. SMITH,	ADDISON F. KNOX.
28,	HENRY R. SELDEN,	SAMUEL P. GOULD.
29,	J. S. WADSWORTH,	WILLIAM C. DRYER.
30,	MARTIN GROVER,	AND'W G. CHATFIELD
31,	WILLIAM H. TEW,	WILLIAM COLVILLE.
32,	JOHN T. HUDSON,	HORATIO SEYMOUR, Jr.
33,	JAS. R. DOOLITTLE,	DEAN RICHMOND.
34,	GEO. H. STONE.	ROBERT H. STEVENS.

The report of the committee was accepted without a dissenting voice, and the persons named duly appointed such delegates and alternates.

On motion, it was likewise

Resolved, That the delegates to the National Convention be and they are hereby empowered to fill any vacancy caused by the absence of both the delegate and the alternate appointed by this Convention.

On motion of Mr. JEWETT, the thanks of the Convention were presented to the Methodist Episcopal Society for the use of their building during the deliberations of the Convention.

On motion of Mr. BOCKEE,

Resolved, That the thanks of this convention be tendered to the Hon. JOHN TRACY, for the ability, fairness and dignity with which he has discharged the duties of President of this Convention.

On motion of Mr. JEWETT,

Resolved, That 20,000 copies of the Address and proceedings of this Convention be printed in pamphlet form, under the direction of a committee for that purpose; and that the Democratic papers of the State, and the *Washington Union* be likewise requested to publish the proceedings.

Messrs. JEWETT, COLVIN, and WATERBURY, were appointed under the preceding resolution, after which the President, in a few appropriate remarks, thanked the Convention for their expression of kindness towards him, and the Convention adjourned *sine die*.

JOHN TRACY, *President.*

Vice Presid'ts.
- HENRY KEYSER,
- ROBT. DENNISTON,
- JOHN KEYES PAIGE,
- H. S. JOHNSON,
- ABIJAH BECKWITH,
- HENRY S. RANDELL,
- GEORGE RATHBUN,
- H. P. DARROW,

Secretaries.
- DANIEL H. TOMPKINS,
- CALVIN P. VARY,
- JAMES W. NYE,
- JAMES S. WHALLON,

Speech of John Van Buren,

At the Democratic State Convention at Utica, February 16. 1848.

Mr. VAN BUREN said :—

It is to be desired that the members of this Convention may adopt a declaration of the principles they entertain, which shall be alike due to the democracy of this state, and at the same time, arrived at with a unanimity, cordiality and concert of action, that shall produce the impression that proceedings thus conducted always produce. With that view it has been my desire either by conversation with the different members of the Convention, or by hearing, which I always like to hear, the views which they may entertain publicly expressed by the delegates themselves, to ascertain their various opinions. It was with that view that I was induced to postpone any remarks I might desire to make until,in some way, I could learn what were the views of the delegates to the Convention in regard to some of the delicate and responsible positions we are called upon to assume. I do not belong to that class of individuals who entertain any apprehension of public discussion, and it seemed to me, at Albany, that if there was any one feature more than another which indicated that the Convention assembled there in the name of the democratic party did not belong to it, it was the fact that whenever they proceeded to transact any business they adjourned. The first motion, when it was proposed to take a step on the part of the Convention, was, to adjourn and caucus outside. That, in my judgment, is not a suitable manner in which to conduct a Democratic Convention.— This practice originated when leading men in the Republican party attended Conventions and controlled their proceedings, and when it was only necessary to report what they directed to the constituent body. That time has gone by. It is opposed to the spirit of the present age, and now a man acts for himself, expresses his opinions, communes with his associates and arrives at the feelings of the Mass He conforms to them, if they accord with his; if not, then he dissents,and if necessary, secedes. The resolutions read by the chairman embody, in the main, so far as I understand them from a single reading, the views I entertain myself in regard to public questions, and individuals. There are, in one or two instances, indications on the part of the committee of a laudable desire to make some expression which shall harmonize the various views of individuals known to be in some degree discordant. On conversing with some members of the com-

mittee, and several other delegales in regard to one or two of the resolutions, I found that their views concurred with my own, both as to what it is expedient to say and what to omit. And inasmuch as this is the fact, I take the liberty of addressing a few remarks to the Convention, in the course of which it will be seen what the views are that others, as well as myself, entertain, and if in any instance they do not agree with the resolutions of the committee it will be necessary to have them, in some degree, modified, or to have a divided vote upon them. I feel that an apology is called for from me, in addressing any additional remarks to this convention after introducing an address embodying, on full consultation with the committee, all the views that it is important in my judgment to express. But there may possibly be something in my position which authorizes me to make a few remarks in this convention which it would not be proper to incorporate in an address coming from a democratic convention representing the great republican party of the State. It is peculiarly proper that such a body should speak with care, deliberation and reflection, and above all with entire unanimity and a full sense of the responsibility due to their position. In reference to myself, from causes not necessary to advert to, I feel entirely at liberty to speak such opinions as truth and justice demand at my hands. I commit nobody, notoriously, by the declarations I make, because they are made solely on my own responsibility, and what may become of them is wholly unimportant, because what becomes of the individual who chooses to express them is equally so. It is eminently wise and proper that leading men in the Republican party should be actuated by a proper degree of care and caution in the views they may express. It is due to themselves and to their friends, because when they take a position which their friends cannot assent to, they embarress those who are in the habit of acting with them, and sacrifice themselves. No such considerations in any respect apply to me.

In regard to these resolutions, they very properly reiterate that great principle of human freedom which has come to be termed, sometimes in derision and sometimes in approbation, the Corner Stone of the democratic faith. And however others may have had difficulty in the matter, I have never found the slightest degree of embarrassment or difficulty, in making this declaration. I saw none at Syracuse, though I probably had not the honor of being a member of that body when the resolution was proposed. I say probably, because if it was not converted into a mob, and was to be considered at that time in the morning as a delegated convention, then a majority of the body had voted that I was not a member. If, on the other hand, it was an aggregation of individuals all speaking at once and in utter disorder, then I was one of its members. Now it was urged in opposition to the resolution there that it was uncalled for, and that it prescribed a new test. Why, where and how does it prescribe a new test? You express the great principles of the republican party, or their preference for individuals, no matter which it may be, and when you come to the polls you act in reference to all these opinions and vote for the candidate who comes the nearest to your standard of all those in nomination. But it is said there was nothing for the State officers to do in regard to this matter. This is true, and it is equally true that there was nothing for them to do in regard to the war, in regard to the Independent Treasury, in regard to the Tariff, and yet nobody deemed it improper to make a declaration of the principles of the Republican party in regard to all these, prior to going into an election. But it was said to be made a test by declaring this opinion, when it was known that some of the individuals nominated did not entertain the faith we profess. Well, without stopping to approve or blame the past conduct of the Republican party, is it not notorious that they have constantly declared opinions and nominated candidates who in some respects in regard to these questions do not conform to the feelings of the nominating conventions. Take for instance the nomination of the most important State officer at Syracuse—the Comptroller. Among the resolutions adopted by that Convention, was one strongly in favor of free trade, and of the tariff of '46, and yet that tariff was voted against by the very man put in nomination. Was a test made then, when they passed a resolution and nominated a candidate whose opinions and action had been in opposition to it? Was there not more propriety in passing a resolution approving the Wilmot Proviso, when this same candidate had, as a member of Congress voted for it? It was not then uncalled for, or improper: in my humble judgment it should have been adopted by the Convention. It should be adopted by every Convention called in the name of the democracy that ever assembled in the State. And you by no means make it a controlling or exclusive test in taking that course. It is said we propose to divide the party, that it was intended by those who proposed the resolution to divide the party; yet that is a declaration and complaint that has been made ever since my recollection, and my recollection in political matters goes further back than most persons of my age. When the Independent Treasury bill was proposed Nathan'l P. Tallmadge, John C. Clark, Gov. Marcy, Mr. Croswell, Mr. Ritchie and other individuals whom I could name said, "you are interpolating a new article into the democratic creed." They resisted it, and Gov. Marcy told me and told the late Gov. Wright, that on the Independent Treasury bill we could not carry ten counties in the State, and it is extremely significant and most unfortunate that the result verified the prediction. The democratic party were thrown into a great minority in the Assembly, and had there only 25 members, I believe, out of 128. But the citizen who then conducted the administration of the General Government did not choose to be discouraged by this defection in his native State and persevered in recommending the Independent Treasury bill in December, 1837 when Congress assembled. And Gov. Marcy in his gubernatorial message, the January following, did the same thing, and that great measure of independence and safety became an article of the democratic creed, and Tallmadge and Clark and others that might be named, went over to the Federal party. Messrs. Croswell and Marcy and

others came back. Whether the great interests of the republican party were more benefitted by the return or defection, I do not now propose to enquire, but shall confine myself merely to a statement of the historical facts. But while they came back, yet they were impotent and helpless and disqualified by the declarations they had made in opposition to this great measure: They had put it in the power of the federal party to refer merely to the editorial articles in the Argus and the Richmond Enquirer, and other papers of that stamp, for arguments in opposition to it.— The Presidential Election of 1840 came on, and what was the consequence? Why, what might easily have been foreseen. The republican party had taken a position they knew to be right,—a position which they have never yet in their history abandoned when once fairly assumed, and which he must be mad who supposes they ever will surrender—and they were found in advocacy of that great principle. But their leading men were cut down in consequence. Mr. Marcy became a candidate for the gubernatorial chair in 1838, and was beaten of course. The State swung into the federal ranks, and in the presidential canvass of 1840 the individual who recommended the measure, in common with the whole party throughout the Union, experienced a signal and disastrous defeat. But the great principle put forward, the great measure itself, was not finally overthrown, and although many of the prominent men who contended for it, suffered for it, the measure itself became the law of the land, as has been well said, "in spite of lamentations here or elsewhere," and the President was elected at the succeeding election on that principle, and it is now the settled policy of the land.

So too when the democracy proposed the bill calling a Convention to amend the Constitution, it was charged that we were dividing the democratic party, that we were introducing a new test and were going with the whigs, and that great measure which should have received the support of every true democrat, experienced the abuse and opposition of the Albany Argus to a degree hardly ever equalled.— There is in this Convention a representative from Dutchess* who served on the joint committee of the two houses in regard to that measure, and to whom undoubtedly, more than any other individual in the State, is owing the fact that that great reform did not fall through in that session of the legislature, who knows the contumely, the abuse, that was continually lavished on Mr. Speaker Crain, himself, and other prominent republicans who persisted in pressing forward this bill at that session, and who refused to flinch from the standard of principle. That great measure when submitted to the people, received their nearly unanimous approval, and the majority to call a Convention was so overwhelming that the original opponents of the measure pretended to be in favor of it. The convention was thus called, it assembled, and the present Constitution was the result of their labors, and it is now the subject of eulogy, not only by the entire Republican party, but by those who opposed it, in consequence of their inability to support a principle the truth of which they admit. Now it is not true, in any sense, that we are dividing the Republican party. This cry of dividing the party is always got up by those who, by resisting reforms, *divide the party themselves*. Submission to its demands would allow any squad of dissentients at any time to control the action of the party. Nor is it true in any sense that we are introducing any new principle. The principle of resistance to the institution of Slavery is as old as the principle of the existence of man. There is not a human being, whatever he may say, whatever may be his local or sectional prejudices, that does not know or acknowledge that the traffic in human flesh, is a disgrace to any people claiming any particle of civilization or christianity. The address I had the honor to report goes on to show that this common principle of humanity has been the acknowledged rule of action of the Republican party of the Union until a very recent time. That while the democracy of the State, under the lead of the patriot Tompkins, decided to abolish slavery as an evil and disgrace to the State, the patriots of the South heartily and cheerfully united with them in all measures which had the limitation of slavery for their object and the melioration of that institution for their end. It has, however, suited the purposes of politicians of the present day to set up a new test and to declare that this great principle shall be abandoned at the approaching presidential election, and they calculate on the love of office to sway the republicans of the State, and to secure, by the exercise of the patronage of the federal government, a majority in the National Convention, who will nominate a candidate in accordance with their views. Now, they have been misled, beyond all doubt, at the south, by the course taken by the republicans of this state in regard to the then immediate annexation of Texas. Most of the leading men in this State took prominent ground against it. Many of the Republican leaders in the State took the same ground, and the Albany Argus, then claimed to be the organ of the party, enquired whether "the people wanted war," and thus enquiring undertook to show that the annexation of Texas immediately must lead to that. Our people thus opposed to the immediate annexation of Texas, sent delegates to the Baltimore Convention, and a candidate was presented who was in favor of the immediate annexation of Texas, and a resolution passed in favor of annexation "at the earliest practicable period." Mr. Polk was put in nomination, and the party called upon to support him. Great principles of popular freedom were then presented to the people—the success of free trade—the establishment of the Independent Treasury—the opposition to the United States Bank—the acquisition and retention of the whole of Oregon as a territory of freedom—filled the public mind of this State, and determined the result of that election. No man familiar with the public sentiment of this State, whatever might be his views in regard to the annexation of Texas, can fail to know that the speakers who addressed the public here in nearly 99 cases out of a 100, thought it expedient and proper to make no reference to this question as an element of the campaign. Nay, more, a candidate for the gu-

*Judge Bockee.

bernatorial chair was selected (and I shall not stop in this Convention to eulogize a man whose memory is embalmed in the heart of every true republican, and even whig in the State—I allude to SILAS WRIGHT) who had voted against the treaty by which Texas was annexed, and who, previous to his nomination, addressed the people in regard to the questions presented in that Convention, and urged the support of Mr. Polk. Gen. DIX addressed the people in every portion of the State with his usual eloquence and ability, and never alluded to the Texas question; and other speakers took the same course. And Mr. Clay, with the peculiar infelicity which seems to distinguish him, broached views in reference to Texas, that made it impossible that any man opposed to annexation, should support him on that ground. The election was thus conducted without this element, and we went to the people with the candidate for President under the candidate for Governor, and carried the State. Now a reflection on these facts ought to satisfy our Southern brethren that a parallel occasion has not now arisen. The great statesman who carried the Electoral Ticket on his shoulders throughout this State, is now no more. The popularity he enjoyed is not possessed by any living man in this State. The great measures of the Independent Treasury and free trade, are substantially settled by the judgment of the country for at least the next twenty-five years—and constitute not only the settled policy of the great republican party, but of the country. The strongest advocate of a Bank of the United States admits it is "an obsolete idea." If therefore Southern statesmen believe that this State will present a similar majority on the issue they now propose, they reckon without their host. The question which we speak of, has a dangerous probability of being presented to the freemen of this State disconnected from any other issue, and he who calculates upon their retraction of opinion or change of conduct, will wofully miscalculate the result to which they will arrive. Now I am free to say for myself, and as I have already said to the members of this Convention, I say so with the more freedom because it is no kind of consequence what my action may be, that I have never entertained but one opinion in regard to the traffic in human flesh, and buying and selling live bodies, and that is an unqualified aversion and disgust for it; and while I would give to those States where it exists the security which the Constitution has given to it, the moment they step an inch beyond this, they attract the public attention and invite a discussion of the evils of slavery. They do so unwisely, and I regret it; but when they do so, the free white people of this State will discuss and condemn it. The idea of marching, in the 19th century, with the immense power of this free republic, upon an enfeebled and half civilized people and forcing upon them the institution of slavery which they reject, and make it a fundamental article of a treaty of peace that they shall be guarded against, is so repugnant to my sense of what is due not merely to the superior magnitude and strength of our own country, but so disgraceful to our free institutions, and so pregnant with evil to the people of both countries, that if I could be satisfied that this war is prosecuted to plant human slavery in Mexico, devoted though I am to the glory, honor, welfare and progress of these United States in every pulsation of my heart, in every breath of my life, in every fibre of my system, so help me God, I would join the Mexicans to-morrow in resisting such oppression! (Applause.) Not only this, but I would pledge myself to recruit, among the freemen of this State armies, while the kingdom of Polkdom was recruiting single men.

But it is said that we must beat the whigs. This has been said to me by a great many. Well, said I, what are we to beat them upon, because when I go into a contest I want to understand what I am fighting for. I have been brought up to believe that these contests involve some principle. It is of no consequence to me who holds the office of President, who receives $25,000 a year, or who is inspector of the customs and gets a certain per diem allowance; to me it is more consequence what are the principles involved.—Well, as a man asked me lately on his way home from Washington, probably under instructions, "is there any probability that the Republican party can rally on the only point that will save the country?" Said I, if they cannot now it is the first time they could not. Said he, "the war ought to have a cordial support throughout the state, and we must make it the issue and beat the whigs." Well, said I, it is difficult to make that the issue in this State, because Gov. YOUNG goes for the war without a proviso. It takes two parties to make an issue always, and if Gov. Young and his friends propose to maintain this ground, (and I presume it is not necessary for me in this Convention to disclaim any particular regard for Gov. Young,) we cannot drive him off, unless they have on their side a peculiarity such as is possessed by the men at Albany and Washington, to scare the whigs from the ground they think right because the democrats are on it, as it is proposed to scare the democrats from their ground because the whigs are on it. I told him that it was difficult to make the war an issue in this State, and that there was no doubt that any man who opposed the war while it was raging must destroy himself in the state and country. The people ask no more questions under such circumstances, than would a man seeing his friend in a fight, inquire of the bystanders how it was got up, instead of at once taking part in it and helping him out. The time to enquire about that is when the fight is over. And the expert whigs at Albany, see it, and they will carry a majority of their friends with them. Well, said he, "is not this new constitution a good issue—this call for a Convention?" You cannot make that the issue with all the whigs, although you can with the Conservatives, because the whigs, the great mass of them, supported the policy, and the Constitution was adopted with their aid. But, there is the great question of human freedom, one to which we are devoted, and which is the great principle pervading the public mind now. Shall we advocate that? "Why, the whigs are in favor of it!" I shall not stop to question the sincerity of their leaders, because those who know me, know that I have no great respect for that. They may adhere to the policy perhaps, but they show a most unaccountable reluctance to press forward at the present day in its

support, or to present a candidate for the Presidency in favor of it. For no man, in my judgment, is farther from the position of the radical democracy and the electors of this State on this question than Mr. Clay on his Lexington platform. Now, gentlemen, in beating the whigs, and I hold it to be extremely desirable to do so, I propose to do it by adhering to the regular usages of the republican party, in nominating their candidates and putting forward their principles, and however many of the other party choose to come to their support, I can only say that it will not deter me from supporting my own principles and men—No! not even if it left us no one to beat but the Conservatives—a victory not worth bragging about.

Again, it has been urged that we must be silent as to certain great principles, take back the bolters and beat the whigs. We are in a minority now, and those men who are most anxious to secure success at all hazards, seem to forget that when Gov. WRIGHT, the most popular man in the State, ran for Governor, he was defeated by a majority of 10,000; and that the recent ticket nominated at Syracuse was defeated by a majority of 38,000. It is, therefore, highly desirable that those who are looking forward for something, should consider our present condition. We have an administration professing democracy, and we have too the declaration of the individual brought to Washington to be the mouth piece of that administration, that it is "*no recommendation to the administration to be a friend of the Wilmot Proviso.*" Then of course SILAS WRIGHT was not a man favorably recommended to the administration, and, of course, all our Congressional delegation, our legislators and most of our electors come under the same description of persons who have not succeeded in recommending themselves to this administration. Nay, more, there has recently occurred a circumstance in Washington in regard to the dispensation of the patronage of the general government, which, after all the explanation that has been made of it, seems to me to indicate that it is intended to make it a test in that distribution, whether a man does or does not believe in the principle of the Wilmot Proviso, if you choose—Mr. Myers proposition, if you please—or the great principle in the abstract, of consecrating free soil to freedom. Not only that, but there are indications that it is the intention to make it a test at Baltimore, and that they propose to give us a President for the next four years, who of course will dispense the patronage of the government in conformity with the test by which he is to be nominated, and the practice of the administration which he is to succeed. Well, if that is so, gentlemen, if that is the fact, then, beyond all question, we are most emphatically out of power now in the State and Union, and we should be infinitely worse in the minority after that administration has been chosen which is to proceed on the ground I have stated.

Such then is our present position, and it becomes men of ordinary courage and intelligence to look the subject in the face, because nothing is gained by determined or resolute men in attempting to avoid the difficulties of their position, or by flinching from making provision in regard to them. We are then, as I have already stated, in that comfortable position known to a great many persons, of an inability to be worse off than we now are, except by being disgraced.—Now this convention is called for the purpose of selecting, and I believe has already selected, 36 delegates to Baltimore. They have very properly, in my opinion, presented no candidate for the Presidency, because, in my judgment, the convention is not prepared now to express with entire unanimity and accuracy, the choice of those whom they represent These delegates will go to Baltimore and be received in that convention. I have heard it suggested that they would not and I wish to advert to that. They will be received there. They will go there, thirty-six intelligent and enlightened men; they will carry with them the principles of the republican party of New York—the assurance that they truly represent those principles, and that whoever will carry them out, will receive the electoral vote of the State over Mr. Clay by a majority more commanding than was ever before given in this State. Depend upon it nothing is more simple, in my humble judgment, than to give the Electoral vote of the State in opposition to the principles expressed by Mr. Clay. They are not the feelings of the people of this State, and will never receive their assent. In my judgment our delegates to Baltimore will say to that Convention, do you desire us to participate in this selection of the candidate or do you propose to have the election, so far as your nominee is concerned, go by default? Now, whatever may be the judgment of others, my opinion is that in a nominating convention, if one may judge anything by the experience of 1844, one of the strongest arguments you can use in regard to a nomination is, give us A or B to represent our principles, and we will elect him; but give us a man pledged against us, and he will not be elected. That is an argument which addresses itself with great force, not only to those men who wish to advance the principles of the party, but to that other and more active corps who never fail to be present at a nominating convention, who look to the patronage of the government for the life-blood of their existence. I anticipate, therefore, that the delegates, on going to that convention, will be received, and will steadily and strongly declare the views of the democracy of this State, and in so doing, will secure the nomination of a candidate around whom the Republican party of the Union can rally. They will do so unembarrassed by any instructions or pledges, having no qualifying test prescribed beforehand, and having only to say—"We represent a certain set of principles; New York has no candidate for the presidency, and at least gratify us so far as to give us a man who will conform to the principles of human freedom, and the faith of the democratic party as it has existed for ages. If you think to bring us down from the platform we stand on to the miserable grovelling position you occupy, and suppose that a second Texas case has arisen, you misconceive the position of the State, then and now, and do not know the individuals who are to take part in the contest of 1848" We may assume, therefore, that the delegates will be admitted to the Convention; but suppose that

they are rejected. Suppose that a majority will be found in that Convention who will be willing to violate the clear usages of the party and to reject the delegation from this State, or what is the same thing, to do as was done at Syracuse on a small scale, swelling the convention from one hundred and twenty-seven to one hundred and thirty-seven members, take in a double delegation, and neutralize the voice of the State. Then our delegates have nothing to do but to come home, under the assurance thus given them by their brethren at Baltimore, that the republican party of the Union is disbanded, and that it is the business of every State to look out for itself.

Well then, gentlemen, I agree with those who suppose we must have a ticket in the field for the presidential election, and I agree with those who think we suffered greatly last fall from not having a ticket to represent us on which the democracy might have rallied. But it must be recollected that last fall the appearance of regularity, and the actual machinery of the party was in the hands of the conservatives. They got the show of regularity, and you would find on the vote of the electors of this State, a respectable number, who, under any circumstances would adhere to such a nomination, and thus a faction insignificant in numbers and contemptible in point of character, would have appeared nearly equally to divide the republicans of the State. This is now altered. Fortunately for us, those men have seceded from the republican party. They have set up an organization for themselves, and fraudulently even on their own principle, have nominated an electoral ticket, when it is notorious their convention was not called for that purpose. However, they have got their ticket in the field, I am happy to say, and I hope that they will keep it there. I perceive too that though the ticket is not raised, the Argus has raised their flag. It is the Guerrilla flag, with a death's head upon it—most appropriate certainly, a skeleton should have a death's head — and with the motto upon it of "No Quarter;" which sounds most preposterous from a faction who can hope to overpower no one and have no quarter to give. I presume the other conservative presses will each in due season be furnished with duplicates, for the original, as we are assured, is in the War Department! And no matter who may be named by the Baltimore Convention, they are pledged to support him. No matter who it is, whether black or white, nor what may be his principles, that electoral ticket is to support that nominee, or in the words of some they "go it blind." This then will be the condition of the Republican party. An electoral ticket under a guerrilla flag, and a candidate that may be presented by fraud and outrage—a bolting electoral ticket that no true man would support under any circumstances And I am free to say that I will support the ticket of the regular Democratic Convention that nominates a Governor, Electors, &c. and will refuse to support the electoral ticket, as at present nominated, under any contingency—nay, even if in defiance of his well known wishes the convention should nominate Martin Van Buren for the Presidency. I propose the next fall to be strictly regular, whatever I may have been the last, [applause;] and no matter who or what may be put in the field at Baltimore, that Electoral ticket is irregular and bolting, tried by any test that may be applied to it, and never will receive my support. It will be the duty of the democratic members of the Legislature to call a State convention, with a view to nominate a candidate for Governor and an Electoral ticket, and either when that Convention meets or before, it will become the duty of the democratic party carefully and earnestly to enquire who should receive the electoral vote of the State. For, that the electoral ticket nominated by that State convention regularly called, will succeed in securing the suffrages of a majority of the voters in this State, I have not the slightest doubt. Now between that time and this, there will be ample opportunity afforded for ascertaining the wishes and views of the democrats of the State in regard to the Presidential ticket they may desire to vote.

I agree cordially in the resolution expressive of the esteem in which the democratic party hold THOMAS H. BENTON. I remember the proud part he took in securing the expunging of the resolution of censure on Gen. JACKSON—the bold and steady course he pursued on the Independent Treasury bill—the open and manly stand he has ever taken in behalf of Democratic principles, and I honor his ability, industry and signal disinterestedness. So there is a citizen of Pennsylvania who has just received proofs of the confidence in which he is held in his own State in being elected to the first office in the State by a majority of from 10,000 to 15,000, and I could cordially support a man of his integrity and ability. So too, a citizen of our own State, most appropriately alluded to in the resolutions, distinguished for his republican manners, his high sense of honor, strict integrity and rare accomplishments; and who is daily giving in the U. States Senate the most striking evidences of his ability to succeed to the place made void in the affections and service of this people, the vacuum left by the death of Silas Wright. In order to secure the nomination of a proper electoral ticket, it will be the duty of the democracy to see that when that Convention assembles, it be composed of men of the same character and integrity and ability as the members of this Convention—that it is not to be directed by time servers—men who hope for profit, and have special objects to serve—but who will select honorable and intelligent candidates for office—who will fairly express the preference and wishes of the democracy of the State of New York.

I know that it is suggested at Washington, I do not know from what source of information, that the delegates from this State may be rejected, and our views not consulted, because they can get along in a presidential election without this State. Well, it is always gratifying to hear those who have been your friends talk stout. It is gratifying to me that there is a point of observation from which it can be seen how a President may be elected on the democratic side without the vote of this State. There may be some facilities for making observations from Washington that do not exist here; but it strikes me that men who will say with the full knowledge of the past history of the country, that a presidential election can be carried in defiance of the wishes

and vote of this State, must be stone blind.—Those familiar with the presidential contests for years long back, know what confidence it gives to a party and how far it goes to secure success to give the assurance that you are able to command it. And nominate a candidate at Baltimore in defiance of the views of New York, or after excluding the rightful delegates of the State to that convention, and you will not only not carry that State, but be utterly beaten in the Union. Let the whigs in Tennessee or Ohio, or any other State that may be deemed doubtful, be able to claim as certain on the 1st of June the 36 electoral votes of New York, and the Baltimore nominee will not get 36 votes in the Union. Everybody familiar with the politics of this country knows that the feeling which pervades New York extends to Michigan, Ohio, Illinois and Indiana, whose people are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. A notice, therefore, to the Democracy of New York that they are not wanted in the canvass, will receive a prompt admission of service in the West.

Now, allow me to say a few words in relation to the condition of the Republican party in this State, though I do not know that I can add anything to the suggestions in the address. There is everything to me attractive and encouraging in the position of the party, in its past history, in the great reforms it has accomplished, in the sound financial system it has established, upheld and incorporated in the fundamental law, and the high moral, political and financial position this State is known to occupy. These are calculated to invite the attention and approbation of every lover of freedom, and of every one who admires successful civil government. And as I said before, I have no more doubt that the regular candidates of the democracy next fall will be sustained by a majority of the votes of the electors, than I do that such a ticket will be nominated—not a particle. It may be perhaps because I belong to the order called sanguine, for I am never afflicted with doubts or misapprehension except when I see a proposition to surrender principles or submit to an imposition. And why not? The regular organization of the party is in the hands of the true democracy, there is no division in regard to the existing war, we are united in cordial support of the new Conrtitution, and the great principle of consecrating free soil to freedom—and on those two great questions our views are those of a vast majority of the electors of this State. In my humble judgment there never was a time when there was promised to the democratic party a more certain victory.—It is no new thing for them to be victorious, but rather it is a new thing for them to be defeated, and that is one of the new things that the Conservatives inflicted on us in 1837, 1838, 1840, 1846, and 1847. The great difficulty heretofore has been in persuading the people of the country who ardently love liberty, that there was any essential difference between the two parties. One is called democratic, and the other at present democratic whig. You go to the people with a question bearing remotely on government like a tariff. We contend that it builds up privileged classes—that it is an imperceptible mode of taxation which conceals and encourages extravagance—that trade should be free. Its advocates reply that it encourages and rewards American industry—that it furnishes a market for agricultural products. Laborious discussion and much time are required to satisfy the public that a Protective Tariff is opposed to the spirit of a free government. So too with the Independent Treasury. It was long before you could satisfy the people, when the Argus and Messrs. Marcy, Tallmadge and others were resisting it, that it was necessarily democratic to separate the government and the treasure of the people from the banks. This has been one of the great difficulties that has affected political action. But go to them on a question about buying and selling a body, a question which overrides all legislative or executive grants of power, or discussion as to their true boundaries, all questions of local interests and comes down to the human being himself, if you cannot make the people believe that it is democratic to resist the extension of human slavery, it is better to abandon politics and adopt some other mode of serving your fellow men. [Applause.] There is therefore every thing, it seems to me, calculated to invite on the part of the democracy of this State, such a course as is conscientiously pursued by this Convention. And it does appear to me that with young men who peculiarly look to questions of principle, and discussions calling for the exercise of ardent patriotism and enlightened intelligence, there is everything in the clearness and directness of the principles presented by the democratic party to secure their generous support. Nay more, if they are actuated by motives of ambition, I can point them to the prospect for the future, and an almost uninterrupted ascendancy for the last fifty years. There is every thing in the present position of the democratic party calculated to attract the virtuous and patriotic citizen who soars above mere office and looks to the vindication and establishment of the great principles of truth and freedom.

I have now adverted to all the points which I regard as prominent, that are noticed in the resolutions, with the exception of one. I refer to one which speaks in just and proper terms, in my judgment, of a distinguished military man, who has reflected honor on his country, and if the period has arrived in this country when there is a general determination to abandon all political questions except the one of freedom and free soil; and to resort to moral qualifications instead of political ones in a candidate, you may succeed in presenting that individual as a candidate for your support. I am free to say that at the next Prsidential election one thing is certian—that is, if so insignificent an individual as myself is expected to take part in it, it must be in support of a man who agrees with me in principle—and he must be a *man*.

I have thus adverted to the different views I have thought it necessary or proper to present in regard to the resolutions submitted by the committee. It struck me that it was proper perhaps to modify one of the resolutions introduced, that in regard to making the proviso a test in the Presidential election. I should be inclined my-

self to confine our declarations to what we now think and to what has been already done. On consultation with the committee I find that a majority are inclined to let the resolution stop at the word "*sectional divisions*," without referring to what our action may be in a future contingency. The resolution would then read thus:

Resolved, That while the Democracy of New-York feel called upon by the regard for principle and a conviction of duty to reiterate this emphatic declaration of their sentiments and wishes, they have not how, nor have they ever had, any desire to prescribe a test in the Presidential canvass which might prevent the Union of all who sustain the general principles of the democratic creed; and that they deeply regret that any of their Southern brethren should have unwisely laid down a platform inconsistent with that union and inevitably tending to break up a national party into sectional divisions.

I am inclined to think that those who desire this Convention to express a determination not to support a man as a candidate for the Presidency not in favor of the consecration of Free Territory to Freedom, as well as those who think such a declaration at this time open to the objection we urge against others, and inexpedient, will unite in support of the resolution thus amended. I suggest this amendment, but shall vote for the resolution in either way. I think the proper course for the party in this State on going into Convention with the rest of the Union in good faith is to tell them, that these are the principles of the democracy of New-York, to which we will unalterably adhere; we have no candidate, and having imposed no tests, we have no compromises to suggest. Give us your man and tell us the principles on which you propose to stand before the American people, and let us see whether we can support him and them. And when they comply with this reasonable request, and give us their man, and he is nominated by the Convention, and our delegates acquiesce in the selection, then it will become the duty of those who at the election day deposit the ballots to say what and how many tests they will impose—who, and which of the candidates they will select.

Speech of Mr. Rathbun,

OF CAYUGA,

At the Democratic State Convention at Utica, February 16, 1848.

Mr. BATHBUN said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: The call upon me is entirely unexpected, and has taken me so much by surprise that I feel myself unable to respond to it in a suitable manner. I am little accustomed to speak in the presence of such a large and august assembly as this. Besides, sir, I have listened with such intense interest to the reading of the able, eloquent and unanswerable address, by my learned friend, Mr. VAN BUREN, that what few ideas I had at its commencement, have entirely evaporated. But since I am upon the floor I will proceed to make a few remarks not on general topics, but in reference to matters relating immediately to the action and objects of the democratic party in this State. The address presents distinctly our principles, and defends not only our principles, but our position with extraordinary ability. It points with unerring certainty to the evidences of the interference of the National Administration in our domestic politics. It shows, that that rickety concern called the Albany Convention, authorized by no party, representing no constituency in this State, is the fruit of that unwarrantable interference. Sir, no man of ordinary observation can fail to have perceived, from the close of the election of 1844, up to the present moment, that a scheme of disorganization, tending to the ultimate division of the democratic party in this State has been pursued with a degree of zeal and energy worthy of a better cause; and that the faction engaged in that scheme here, have been publicly approved and upheld by the organ of the administration at Washington, and with very few and unimportant exceptions, the members of that faction have been the recipients of all official favors of the administration itself. In spite of protestations to the contrary, these things are regarded by the democratic party of this State not only as an approval of, but as the inducement to this disturbance in the democratic ranks. The faction thus encouraged have no principles, no object, save the spoils of office derived from public plunder.

To obtain this, although living in a great, free and prosperous State—in a State from which the curse of slavery has been blotted out under the wise and humane recommendation of that pure patriot and statesman Gov. TOMPKINS, sanctioned and sustained by the whole people, yet so degraded and corrupt and shameless is this faction, that they are willing and anxious to become the tools in the hands of southern men to aid in extending this curse of the white man to territory now free. They are ready to turn traitors to the north, traitors to the democratic party, traitors to the cause of freedom, and free soil, and freedom of labor, and free speech. I speak not of the condition of the slave. I do not pretend to know, nor is it necessary that I should express an opinion in this place, whether the effect of Slavery is beneficial or injurious to him. I am looking to its effect upon the white man, the free white man of the country; men who labor, and whose wives and children labor, whose labor is their capital, and who are honored and respected because they labor. This faction are ready and willing to degrade this class, to render labor disgraceful by bringing it in contact with servile labor. They are ready to brutalize it by depriving it of the common schools. Slavery and the degradation and ignorance of the laboring white population are unavoidable—they go hand in hand. The school disappears, education is confined to a few who govern with equal facility the laboring people of the country, bond and free, and through the influence of this institution they govern the free states, as they have with trifling exceptions, for the last fifty years. All this the Rodin of the Argus, and his jesuit band are willing to aid in effecting for the paltry consideration of office. We are charged with opposition to the war because we are not the advocates of slavery. We are charged with interpolating new tests into the democratic creed, because we will not make war upon free soil and free labor. We stand where the democratic party—where the whole people of this Union stood in the days of the revolution, and where the democratic party of this State has always stood. We stand upon

the Ordinance of Freedom of 1787, by the side of JEFFERSON. Here the whole people of all the states stood, until John C. Calhoun introduced the new test—the new creed in politics and morals—that "Slavery is the greatest blessing that God ever bestowed upon man" We do not subscribe to this new doctrine. The Union, the big organ, and the Argus, its echo, the little organ, follow Calhoun, and denounce the democratic party of this State because it adheres to the old platform of liberty.

Mr. President—the venerable Senator from Michigan, once an ardent advocate of the Jeffersonian Ordinance of 1787, has discovered some new light, and I understand has recently written a letter to Tennessee, in which he avows himself the advocate of slavery extension. This is a sudden and radical change in the views of that distinguished Senator on that question, and I propose to enquire briefly into the reasons of that change. Mr. President, I know very well the views and feelings of that senator in the month of August, 1846. I learned them from his own lips. On the day that Congress adjourned and at the time that senator DAVIS, of Massachusetts, spoke up to the adjournment of the Senate on Wilmot Proviso, I met the Senator at the Railroad depot in Washington, and rode near to him and conversed freely with him between that place and Baltimore. The senator appeared somewhat excited, spoke freely and with a good deal of energy on the subject of the "Proviso." He stated to me, that every northern democratic Senator had agreed to vote for it, and but for Mr. Davis' speech would have voted for it. He said repeatedly, that "he regretted very much that he could not have recorded his vote for it, before the adjournment." I expressed as much regret as he did, but not precisely for the same reason. *I desired the record*—he the popular applause. He said he never regretted anything more than the failure to record the votes of Senators. Indeed sir, this was the principal topic of conversation to Baltimore. This, Mr. President, continued to be his language all the way to Michigan, as I understand. When we met again at the capitol, I thought I discovered some symptoms of that change in the Senator's views on the subject of the Proviso, which he has since by his vote, and letter, so clearly demonstrated. Mr. Brinkerhoof of Ohio, one of the ablest, and firmest supporters of the Proviso, an honest and sincere Democrat, I know was a warm friend of the Michigan Senator, and preferred him to all others as the candidate for the Presidency in 1848. I mentioned to him my suspicions. I told him the Senator was in the chrysalis state, and that in my opinion he was preparing to desert, to turn traitor to the north, to freedom, and to become a soldier under the black banner of Aggressive Slavery. Mr. Brinkerhoof denied, disbelieved, and thought I was doing injustice to the Senator, invited me to go with him and call on the Senator and I would be satisfied I was mistaken. I expressed my willingness to go with him at any time and assured him of the great pleasure it would afford me to find myself mistaken on this point.

Mr. President, at the suggestion of Mr. B. we proceeded at once to the room of the Senator. We found him somewhat bustling and busy in his preparation to go out. Mr. B. led off in some casual remarks about the Proviso and its prospects—the bustle increased a little. The Senator "thought it premature,—better to give it the go by this sessin, nothing to be gained by pressing it now—sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." I was anxious to bring the thing to some point, and for that purpose remarked to the Senator that there were important reasons for pressing that question to a vote in both branches, which probably had not occurred to him, and they were these—the South had usually carried their points against the north upon all questions; that when necessary they had always found dishonest men enough in both houses of Congress, who would sell out and enable them to succeed, that the same state of things still existed—that there were men enough in the market to defeat the Proviso and that it would be defeated; that we should be betrayed as we always had been, but that the defeat would be harmless, nothing would be settled by it, the question would remain open, and the people who had dishonest representatives here, whose rights were to be bartered and betrayed, would have time to get rid of the traitors and send honest men in their places, before the final settlement of the question and thus we were to be saved. The Senator replied, "Oh, if it comes to the vote I am with you, you know."—"Of course you are," was the reply, and thus we separated. This conversation was some three weeks previous to the vote taken on the Proviso.

But, Mr. President, this is not all I have to say of the Senator from Michigan and his marvellous change. About two weeks previous to the vote which was taken on the Proviso, I met in the streets of Washington, a gentleman of distinction from one of the Slave States, now a Senator in Congress, who enquired of me what I thought of General Cass? My reply was, very little.—"Will he do as he agrees?" he asked. I answered him that, that depended, in my opinion, altogether upon the consideration. "Well," said he, "if he should promise to vote against the Proviso upon the ground that the South are to support him as the candidate for the Presidency, do you believe he would do so?" I told him there was no doubt about it; upon that consideration he was as sure as death, and I thought he might, if he wished, throw in the hanging of a few northern men in addition. Mr. President, I do not undertake to say here that Mr. Cass made a bargain or the bargain which I have just referred to. I can only say that the gentleman who informed me of the fact, is a man of honor and unquestioned veracity. He was not a party to the bargain, but simply gave it his assent, providing the general fulfilled on his part, which he has since done to the letter. Mr. President, I have not seen the Senator's Tennessee letter.—I do not know its contents, except upon information. I am told he says in that letter, that he thinks he sees, and really feels a change going on in the Free States against the ordinance of freedom, and in favor of the extension of slavery. It is said that the change in the Senator is so complete, that he avows his readiness in that letter to veto, if he should be President, the Ordinance of 1787, an ordinance drawn by Jefferson, voted for by every member of Congress except one,

and which gave to the State of Michigan universal freedom, and will ultimately make her one of the great States of the Union. Such a man is unworthy of the confidence or support of any democrat. No honest man, of any party can vote for him. He is worthy of his party in this State and they of him. He is the embodiment and true exponent of the principles of Edwin Croswell's Convention. His nomination by any party would defeat it in this State, by more than one hundred thousand votes.

His gaze upon the glittering walls of the *White House*, has obscured his vision, his head became giddy, and he mistook the imaginary whirl and change of scene, for something real. He gave a desperate leap for the *White House* and will light in the mire and filth of the wrecked hopes and blighted prospects of an ambitious but worn out politician. The Senator is a little too fond of hobby-riding. He mounts every one that comes within his reach, applies whip and spur until the poor thing is run into the ground. Now he is mounted upon a poor little ill-looking, black, long-haired, long-eared, shaggy pony, whipping, spurring, puffing and blowing, in favor of Slavery, as the direct road to the Presidential Chair. He goes the whole for slavery, nothing for freedom. His competitors in the field are mounted much after the same fashion, all on the same hobby; some are all for slavery, some for half; some for about 36° 30',—not one in the crowd on the Presidential race course, shouts for freedom and free labor, or is mounted on a nag that bounds from earth to Heaven with the power, spirit or energy of freedom. I do not desire, Mr. President, the election of such men. If liberty is to be bartered and strangled by slavery, it is better that the whigs should do it. I cannot tolerate a Northern men who will degrade himself and his country in the estimation of all good and true men, for the sake of an office. Sooner than see the Senator from Michigan elected President, or any northern man who thinks and acts like him on this subject, I would infinitely prefer one who has been mentioned here to-day. (Several voices: name him, who is it?) I allude to General Zachary Taylor. (Applause.) But, Mr President, I am in favor of an honest, sound, reliable, northern man, a true and genuine democrat, who cannot be bought and sold or intimidated by any section, interest or faction.

Mr. President, I have alluded to the charge of the organs, Mr. Ritchie's and Mr. Croswell's, of opposition to the war. Sir, those organs always play the same tunes, and carry two parts in perfect harmony. Against Gen. Jackson, when first a candidate for the Presidency, they performed harmoniously. On the Independent Treasury and against Mr. Van Buren their concerts were greatly applauded by the Whigs—the war, the proviso, abusing the democratic party of N. York, and endeavoring to destroy it, are performed in excellent style and with most ludicrous effect. Mr. President, I know little of actual war. I have read of wars where powder and lead have destroyed their thousands. I have read with pride of the achievements of our brave troops and valiant officers in Mexico. War is expensive, great sacrifice of human life, of money, are necessary to carry it on. Now, sir, I think the administration at Washington lack knowledge and experience in the art of war. They do not seize the means at hand best adapted to the accomplishment of their designs. If I might be permitted to suggest to the Secretary of War, it does appear to me that he might speedily close this war by the destruction or conquest of Mexico. Sir, if the Secretary will send the organ and its editor, and the little organ and its editor, Messrs. Ritchie and Croswell, into Mexico with instructions to pursue, in reference to the Mexicans, the same course that they have for the last few years towards democrats and the democratic party of this State, and of the Union—they would soon produce so much discord, disunion and anarchy that all resistance will soon cease, and Mexico is ours.—Sir, let them perambulate the territory of Mexico, harping upon the same string, ringing eternal changes in the same tune—confusion and despair will seize the poor Mexican, and he will consent to be a slave for the sake of harmony.—They have already performed greater things than this. When the Union sounded its first note and assumed the right to take the whip and reins, the democratic party had very nearly two-thirds of the members in both branches of Congress united and harmonious. When the Argus commenced to echo its song, the democrats in this State were as strong.

In two short years they dissipated and destroyed our whole force, and put the power into the hands of the whigs. The House of Representatives is whig and the Senate still worse; the balance of power there is in the hands of political cow-boys. At home all is whig. Every political office in the State of any importance, is in whig hands. This is the work mainly of Croswell and Ritchie. If they can do all this, will any one pretend that they cannot conquer Mexico? But if there is any doubt of their success with such weapons, then Croswell should be authorized to preach up a crusade in favor of subduing Mexico for the extension of Slavery He is not without experience in this branch of business. He has shown his capacity, by his crusade against one of the purest, wisest and best men and patriots in the fall of 1846. He has shown his tenacity of purpose by yielding only to the more insatiate demands of the grave. Peter, the hermit, was aided by the religious zeal and fanaticism of the age; duty, morality and religion, aided in moving and exciting the multitude; the recovery of the holy land was a most meritorious work, and death in its accomplishment the sure entrance to paradise. Mistaken but honest motives governed the crusaders in Peter's time.—But Croswell's crusade against Silas Wright had no attractions for good or honest men. It was an attack upon every principle of morality, and violated every principle of religion. Mercenary motives, prejudices, bad passions were appealed to successfully for the accomplishment of a most infamous act. Sir, a man so gifted to move the bad passions of bad men, could point to the ruins of Mexico, the sure hope and prospect of public plunder, aided now and then by a flourish of patriotism, and his army of crusaders, avaricious as merciless, would fall upon Mexico with the same secresy and subtlety, and with the same fatal effect that they did upon the lamented

SILAS WRIGHT. Mr. President, I owe this Assembly an apology for having occupied so much of its time.

The Democratic Press.

Preaching and Practice.

[From the Jefferson Democrat.

We are pleased to see, by the last Jeffersonian that a "Congressional District Convention," for the choice of a delegate to represent the twenty towns of Jefferson county, composing the 19th district, in the Democratic National Convention, is called a week from next Tuesday. At the American, in Watertown. Messrs. J. C. Dann, William Carlisle, and Abner Burlingame appear to have affixed their names to such a call, as a "Congressional District Committee," and have endorsed this prospective assembly as *democratic.*

To do away with the *useless* machinery attendant upon recognizing the validity and utility, of Town Committees, "the democratic electors of the National Administration, and approving the proceedings of the Albany and Syracuse State Conventions," are *directly* requested by the aforesaid J. C. Dann, Wm. Carlisle and Abner Burlingame, to meet on Friday the 3d of March next, and elect at least three delegates to represent their respective towns in said Convention; and the sapient and democratic editor of the Jeffersonian, pronounces the authority of Messrs. J. C. Dann, Wm. Carlisle and Abner Burlingame, "clear and undeniable," from the following postulate and syllogism. "The democratic electors favorable, &c., can only assemble under authority," "All authority is derived from the Albany State Convention;" Messrs. J. C. Dann, Wm. Carlisle and Abner Burlingame, in their capacity as a committee, are an emanation from the Albany State Convention. Therefore Messrs. J. C. Dann, Wm. Carlisle and Abner Burlingame can authorize the assembling of the democratic electors favrorable, &c. "without the formality of the intervention of the town committees."

Although we should consider it most unfortunate if by any means this "Congressional District Convention" does not assemble, or the precedent meetings of the electors "approving of the proceedings of the Albany and Syracuse Conventions" do not take place, yet there are one or two prominent features in this procedure that seem to demand a passing notice from us.

Mr. Surrogate McVean prepared for the Albany Convention an address, and in addition thereto delivered himself of a speech, in both of which he discoursed largely of "central influences." Now, although he seemed impelled to do this, much in the manner the murderer is forced at last, by the tormenting furies, to proclaim his crime, yet his inate courtesy forbidding his laying to his colleagus—the Croswells, Cornings, Denios, & Co.—this sin of the Albany regency, he must per force, ridiculous as was the position it placed him in, ascribe it to the *Radicals.*— On his own side, he claimed, speaking for the above Croswells, Cornings, &c., that, "Henceforth the people will be their own leaders. Public opinion which hitherto was elaborated at the centre and compelled to the extremes, henceforth will be the aggregation of individual opinions flowing in free and healthy channels from the extremes to the centre."

The practical comment afforded on the above well rounded text, by these Albany preachers, may be gathered from their appointment of Messrs. J. C. Dann, Wm. Carlisle and Abner Burlingame, as a Congressional committee, to exercise authority over electors who had no hand in their selection, and to annul the functions of town committees that might not recognize theirs, and assist in convoking these electors. In truth it was doubtless intended that this declaration against "central powers," should have the same force with the hostility to banks and desire for freed trade that are also manifested in this address; while the initiated might look in another place for the correct instruction on this point, although it is disguised by a *past* tense. "The lords paramount *at the centre* controlled (are to control) *the intermediate lords in the centre of each county*, and they again controlled (are to control) their minor divisions."

As we have remarked, we hope this triffling circumstance will not prejudice the assembling, according to the call, of the democratic electors "approving the proceedings of the Albany convention;" for really, this class of democrats can not spare a single member from their attenuated ranks without fearfully jeopardizing their ability to carry out the suggestion of the editor of the Jeffersonian to appoint town committees on the 5th from among themselves; we fear as it is, judging from a memorable convention held in Mr. Russell's parlor, some towns will have to retain to their old committee from utter inability to find among its democrats one even who "approves" according to the standard.

The Utica Convention—What Cause is there for Continued Dissensions?

[From the Rochester Daily Advertiser.]

We briefly remarked on Saturday that the doings of this Convention present little cause of complaint on the part of sound and disinterested democrats. Considering the excited state of political and personal feeling, we think this remark is emphatically true.

What did it do? What principles did it avow —what policy recommend—what 'tests' establish to which all good democrats will not heartily respond? Let us see.

As the proceedings are not published in extenso, we will state from recollection, and in general terms, the principle measures put forth in the address and resolutions. These were: ultimate free trade with a revenue tariff in the mean time; the policy of '42; opposition to public debt, state or nation; opposition to the land monopoly; vigorous war measures so long as war continues; hostility to the European balance of power system, as applied to the North American continent, 'at any sacrifice of treasure and blood;' hostility to the forcible annexation of the populous parts of Mexico, though in favor of territorial indemnity as the only feasible means on the part of Mexico, of liquidating our just claims upon her; in favor of excluding slavery from territory to be acquired, so long as it remains a terri-

tory; the general ticket system of choosing delegates to the National Convention, and so on.

Not to enumerate all the topics embraced in the Address and Resolutions—which we are unable to do from unassisted memory—what is there in the above to which "sound and disinterested democrats" will object? Look over the list again, and when the official proceedings shall be published, look with yet closer, but still impartial scrutiny, and then say what there is in all the principles, measures and recommendations of the Utica Convention, which furnishes sufficient cause for perpetuating divisions in the bosom of the Democratic party, which have so often resulted in overwhelming disaster. We appeal to the Democracy of Monroe and of Western New York generally, to consider the whole matter candidly—as men desiring above all things of a political nature, to witness the triumphant establishment of principles and measures for which they have so long struggled, surrounded by towering local majorities,—we appeal to them as patriotic, as reasonable men, to say if there be anything here presented which calls for a permanent separation of brethren, who have so long toiled, and still professedly continue to toil, for the attainment of common objects? If so, where is it? In what does it consist?

It will be said by persons, to whom, as well as to whose motives, objects and aims we now forbear to allude more particularly, that there is good and sufficient cause for separation; that they cannot honestly (!) and consistently maintain the doctrines of the Utica platform; and hence they must insist on a distinct and really hostile organization; and why?

Their principal grievances are two, and so far as we know, they are two only: the Utica Convention adopted the general ticket system, and it also adopted what will be called the Wilmot Proviso, at the same time disclaiming any idea of making it a test of Democratic orthodoxy.—Opposition to these measures, in the opinion of a few political *puritans* among us, justify a resort to antagonistic organizations, in fact to an absolute division of the patriotic republican party.

A word on these points: what is there in the results of the general ticket system, so far as this county is concerned, which calls for the election of another delegate? The State Convention constituted for the 'express purpose' of determining how delegates should be elected, decided after proper deliberation that it was inexpedient to abandon the old mode of electing by States. The consequence is, that Henry R. Shelden Esq., was chosen to represent this county and district in the Baltimore Convention. What objection to Mr. Selden? Will he not faithfully represent his constituents? Were you to re-select a delegate, would you not be at least as willing to select Mr. Selden as any body else? He is regularly elected, in pursuance of immemorial usage, and what pretext can be justly assigned for electing another? Will the masses ponder the import of these?—for they apply as fitly to other portions of Western New York as to Monroe.

Another view of the general ticket system; it is a question of organization only, it is eminently a proper one to be determined by *a majority*, to whose decision a minority ought cheerfully to submit. Is not this so? What would become of political parties, if, in every case of disagreement in matters of organization, the minority should refuse to submit to the majority, and should "bolt" and set up an antagonistic organization? Could any degree of efficiency be maintained? Could any confidence be placed in party strength, were that strength liable at any moment to be arrayed against itself on some paltry question of regularity in party procedure—some miserable quibble raised by a mercenary seeker of patronage and plunder? Our own party history for a few years past, is replete with instructions on this point.

But the great *bugbear* is the Wilmot Proviso! The Utica Convention 'resolved' against the extension of slavery into territory now free, and in reference to a possible contingency, evidently looked to Congress to guard the territories against a surreptious introduction of that institution—insisting on its constitutional right to say that slavery shall not exist there, unless the people under a state organization shall authorize it. But in order to meet any honest objection to the legitimate and rightful authority of congress over it, the convention further resolved, that a recognition of the right claimed for Congress should not be a "test" in the democratic creed.

Now what is there wrong in all this? Whence the necessity for a new and hostile organization, *unless* indeed, it be *for the purpose of extending slavery into territory now free?*

Inasmuch then as perfect tolerance of opinion as to the extent of the power of Congress over the institutions of the territories, is recognized by the Utica Convention, it follows that NO ISSUE can fairly be raised on that point. But that Convention felt and expressed the most decided repugnance *to the further extension of Slavery;* and here there is a chance for an issue. And we wish the Democracy of this section to take notice of the fact, that if a fair issue on the slave question be raised against the Utica Convention, *it can only be done by taking ground in favor of the extension of that institution!* WE INSIST THIS TO BE A MATTER OF INEVITABLE NECESSITY.

It is fervently to be hoped that the Democracy of Western New York, where slight differences of opinion have not as yet resulted in antagonistic organizations, will be fully impressed with the importance of still maintaining an undivided front. When the official proceedings of the Utica Convention shall appear, as they will in a few days, let them be read with care ane attention; and let every Democrat divest himself of his preju lices and form *his own opinion* as to the necessity of establishing a separate organization for the purpose of combatting successfully the doctrines and the principles promulgated by that body.

Fanaticism of the Slave-Extensionists—the Dough-faces rebuked.

The proceedings of the State Convention of the Democrats of Alabama, held at Montgomery, on the 14th inst., to nominate Presidential electors and delegates to Baltimore, are published, in part, in the Washington Union. A portion, how-

ever, is omitted, which we find copied in the New York Globe. They are of an extraordinary and may add, shameful character. We quote them below:

Whereas, Opinions have been expressed by eminent members of the Democratic party, and by a convention of the party in New York, assembled for the purpose of selecting delegates to the Baltimore Convention, that the municipal laws of the Mexican territories would not be changed in the ceded territory, by the cession to the United States, and that slavery could not be re-established except by the authority of the United States or of the Legislature of the territorial government—that no doubts should be allowed to exist upon a subject so important and at the same time so exciting. Be it further

Resolved, That the treaty of cession should contain a clause securing an entry into those territories to all the citizens of the United States, together with their property of every description, and that the same should remain protected by the United States while the territories are under its authority.

Resolved, That if it should be found inconvenient to insert such a clause in the treaty of cession, that our Senators and Representatives in Congress should be vigilant to obtain, before the ratification of such a treaty, ample securities that the rights of the Southern people should not be endangered during the period the territories shall remain under the control of the United States, either from the continuance of the municipal law of Mexico, or from the legislation of the United States.

Resolved, That the opinion advanced and maintained by some, that the people of a territory, acquired by the common toil, suffering, blood and treasure, of the people of all the States, can, in other events than in the forming a constitution preparatory to admittance as a State into the Union, lawfully or constitutionally prevent any citizen of any such States from removing to, or settling in such territory with his property, be it slave property or otherwise, is a restriction as indefensible in principle and as dangerous in practice, as if such restriction were imposed by act of Congress.

Resolved, That this Convention pledges itself to the country, and its members pledge themselves to each other, under no political necessity whatever, to support for the office of President and Vice President of the United States, any person who shall not openly and avowedly be opposed to either of the forms of excluding slavery from the territories of the United States, mentioned in the resolutions, as being alike in violation of the constitution and of the just and equal rights of the citizens of the slave holding States.

Resolved That these resolutions be considered as instructions to our Delegates to the Baltimore Convention, to guide them in their votes in that body; and that they vote for no man for President or Vice President who will not unequivocally avow themselves to be opposed to either of the forms of restricting slavery which are described in these resolutions.

It is not necessary to point out or dwell upon the enormity of these doctrines. This strained and unwarranted construction of the Constitution is tainted with something worse than the highest Federalism. It is the assertion of a power not existing in the Congress, nor in the Territories, nowhere written or implied, yet omnipotent, to subvert Laws, to establish Slavery, to destroy Freedom. Whence the power is derived they do not say. Where lodged they can not tell. It is an indefinable and unmentioned power, never before discovered, just now developed, faith in which and obedience are exacted as political tests, and which is to operate to overturn an existing local law and establish *peculiar* institutions in its place. What enormous, fatal and preposterous doctr That, in the absence of laws by Congress or authorised action by the Territories, the unwritten but universal law of Freedom would govern the latter, we believe.—For freedom is the natural condition; a state which requires the guaranty of no affirmative law, while slavery is an artificial condition that can only be created, if at all, by the power of actual affirmative laws. The monstrous doctrine of the slave-extensionists is, that there is an undefined common law of the Constitution which authorizes slavery in all the territories of the Union, but which has no place, in its code, for the law of freedom.

It is against the dough faces of the Albany Convention that these denunciations of the Alabama Convention are levelled. Even after crawling in the dust, at the feet of the South, they are spurned and scorned by those whom their abasement sought to conciliate. But let them not despair! Mr. Croswell has gone ahead, as a pioneer, to learn what further degradation is necessary to conciliate the task masters. When the lower depth is sounded, we know well how ready they will be to plunge into it, if anything is to be gained beneath its filthy tide.

A Chance for the Bolters.

There is a chance opened, at last, for the conservative bolting delegates, the Croswells, Peckhams, Whites, &c., brought forth under quack auspices of the Albany convention. Messrs. Peckham & Co. have so often been turned out of Conventions that it will be a consolation for them to get a chance in one, where they can be seated in repose, and not be under the necessity of disguising their principles.

Forty-two firms engaged the Iron business, have called a Convention to meet at Harrisburgh on the 22d of March to agitate the repeal the tariff of 1846, or as they express it—"for the purpose of devising some plan in order to accomplish, by every honorable endeavor, a remedy for the evils complained of, and of making known both to the General and State governments, *the injurious effects of the present revenue laws*, on the great staple interests of Pennsylvania."

Here is a Convention in which Messrs. Corning and Croswell, who labored in the Congressional lobby against the Tariff of '46, may find a comfortable place, congenial associations and principles, and a full swing. They will have no new speeches to learn, as those they made in the lobby in '46 will serve a second time; and they can boast that the threat then leveled against the democratic members of Congress from New-

York—that not one who voted for the present tariff, should be re-elected,—has been nearly fulfiled to the letter, by their disorganizing and bolting efforts.

The Iron Masters have made large profits, for the last eighteen months; they have multiplied mills and furnaces; the increase of their manufacture, over last year, in Pennsylvania alone, is counted by millions of pounds. But they think that they can wring out of the necessities of the country, under the war debt, a little more protection, or can, at least, make panic for Mr. Clay.

The panic of 1844-5 and 6, was, they acknowledge, premature. But they say, with Dick Swiveller, "the iron is just beginning to enter their souls." They are determined on a new panic, and they know how much better one is on the eve, than after an alection.

We trust that those extensive manufacturers of humbug, paper money, political panic, and other protected and non-protected articles, Messrs. Corning & Croswell, will be present at the affair. They will meet the men who endeavored to defeat the Tariff of '46, and who, failing, did throw the present Congress into the hands of the whigs. Let Mr. Corning elect Mr. Croswell delegate, and, (according to usage,) the latter gentleman will reciprocate the favor. Let them, when admitted, read that portion of the Albany Brandreth Address in which they proclaim themselves *the only true friends of Free Trade*, and the assembled manufacturers will give them the highest place as Masters of *iron*-y and of humbug.

THE SEPTEMBER CONVENTION.—Whatever a few factionists may say of the call of a State Convention by the Legislative Caucus, or however they may assail the majority of the democrats of the Legislature, their action meets the general approval of the democratic masses and press.—The Otsego County Democrat, after adverting to the pitiable inconsistency of those who last fall contended that the power over this subject was in the hands of the democratic caucus of this Legislature, and not in that of the last, and who now deny the power of either, says:

"We are gratified to see that Messrs. CHAMBERLAIN and SAUNDERS, from this county, attended, participated and correctly represented their constituents, by acting with the majority and according to regular democratic usages."

Mr. Wilmot at Home.

The Democratic Convention of Bradford Co., Pa., held on the 8th inst, adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That our confidence in the Hon. David Wilmot is unabated. That we know his true-hearted devotion to Democratic principles, and the rights of man; we cannot and will not be driven from his support, so long as he continues on the side of justice and humanity. Never will we assist to strike down the man who strives for constitutional freedom. That we are unawed, as we trust he is, by the influences which are at work to prostrate him. That when patronage and power combine in a crusade against honesty of purpose, duty, which is paramount to all other considerations, demands us to stand firmly on the side of right.

Mr. W. was then elected one of the two delegates to the Harrisburgh Convention by a vote of 59 out of 60! The insolent denunciations of the Washington Union, and the slang of the Conservative organ here, seem to have only the effect of strengthening a champion of Freedom and Democracy in the estimation of the Democratic masses.

Democratic Joint Caucus.

At a Caucus of the Democratic members of the Legislature held at the Senate Chamber on the 21st inst., at 7½ o'clock, P.M., pursuant to a call of the Senate committee and a majority of all the Democratic members elected to the Assembly; the meeting was called to order by Mr. Senator FLOYD, on whose motion Hon. SAXTON SMITH, was appointed Chairman.

Mr. COBB and Mr. MYERS were appointed Secretaries.

The roll being called five Senators and nineteen of the Assembly answered to their names:

Messrs. Fine, Floyd, Hawley, Smith, Whallon of the Senate, and Bowie, Calhoun, Chamberlin, Charlock, Heaton, Keith, Kennedy, Little, Maxon, Moss, Myers, Peck, Saunders, W. Sydney Smith, Stewart, Toll, Townsend, Winslow, Cobb, of the Assembly.

The Chairman announced that a majority of the democratic members of both Houses were present.

Mr. FINE offered the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it be recommended to the democratic electors of each Assembly district in the State, to appoint a delegate to a State Convention, for the purpose of nominating candidates for electors of President and Vice President; for Governor and Lieut. Governor, and for such other State officers as are to be chosen by general ticket at the next fall election.

Upon this resolution the ayes and noes were called, and the vote thereupon was as follows:—

Ayes—Messrs. Floyd, Fine, Hawley, Smith, Whallon, Bowie, Calhoun, Chamberlin, Charlock, Cobb, Heaton, Keith, Kennedy, Little, Maxon, Moss, Myers, Peck, Saunders, W. Sidney Smith, Stewart, Toll, Townsend, Winslow—24.

Nays—None.

The following resolution also offered by Mr. FINE, in blank as to time and place, was filled up and unanimously passed:

Resolved, That the State Convention be held at Utica on the 13th day of September next at 12 o'clock, M

Mr. MYERS offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That a joint committee of three from the Senate and five from the Assembly, be appointed by the Chair to prepare an Address and Resolutions, to be submitted to an adjourned meeting of the democratic members of the legislature.

Which was unanimously adopted and the chair named the following gentlemen as such committee:—

Messrs. FLOYD, FINE, HAWLEY, MYERS, KEITH, PECK, LITTLE.

And thereupon the Caucus adjourned to meet at the same place on Wednesday the fifth day of April next at 7½ o'clock, P. M., at the Senate Chamber.

SAXTON SMITH, Chairman.

CHAS. G. MYERS, } Secretaries.
WILLIAM COBB, }

THE ALBANY ATLAS.

THE DAILY EVENING ATLAS, SIX DOLLARS per annum. Mail subscribers are expected to pay in advance, or furnish satisfactory city reference.

THE ALBANY ATLAS, (Semi-Weekly,) published on Tuesday and Friday of each week, and containing all the matter of the Daily: TWO DOLLARS per annum, if paid in advance, or $3,00 if not so paid—being the cheapest paper in the State.

THE ALBANY ATLAS, (Weekly,) a sheet of the largest size; filled entirely with reading matter to the exclusion of all advertisements, and published every Saturday: ONE DOLLAR per annum, if paid in advance, or $1,00 if paid otherwise.

VAN DYCK & CASSIDY, EDITORS.

ALBANY, November, 1847.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 464 390 7